THE EFFECTS OF AN EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE UPON THE TEACHING CONCERNS AND PUPIL CONTROL ORIENTATIONS OF BEGINNING PRESERVICE TEACHERS

BY

LILA L. BUCHANAN

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1981

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the contributions, guidance, and support of the following persons, this dissertation would not have been completed. The writer wished to pay tribute to these special people.

Dr. William D. Hedges, my chairman, has been unfailing in his guidance, concern, encouragement, and conscientious efforts in helping in this work. His respect for me and trust in my efforts gave me the courage to pursue my goals. I am deeply grateful for his assistance.

Dr. Marcella Kysilka has been a constant source of support and honest feedback throughout all of my graduate work. I am indebted to her not only for serving on my committee but for being my mentor and friend.

Dr. Robert Lange, Dr. Paul George, and Dr. Charles Henderson, committee members, have contributed their unique talents, advice, and wisdom to this study. I appreciate their generous giving of their time and their willingness to serve.

I am thankful to all those people who participated in this study. Among these people are Dr. William Esler, who allowed me to use the department for conducting the study, Ms. Eleanor Fisher of ADDitions, who cooperated so fully, the faculty members who allowed me to use their students, and the students, themselves, who were the subjects.

Finally, I wish to thank my family: Roy and Leah Buchanan for their continuing support of my efforts; my children, Greg and Kevin, for their patience and devotion; and my husband, Bill, without whose encouragement I would never have begun my graduate work and without whose love, faith, and sacrifice I would never have finished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES vi

ABSTRACT viii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 1
Rationale 1
Summary of Procedures 4
Assumptions and Limitations 6
Definitions of Terms 7
Summary and Preview 9

II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 11

Initial, Pre-student Teaching Field Experience Effects 11
Research and Theory Related to the Development of Concerns of Teachers 20
Research on the Development of Instrumentation to Measure Teacher Concerns 27
Research and Theory Related to Pupil Control Ideology 30
Development of the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI) . 35
Summary 37

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES 39

Subjects 39
Descriptions of the Field Experiences 42
Methods of Data Collection 43
Methods of Data Analysis 49
Summary 50

IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY 52

Introduction 52
The Study Design 52
Data Analysis 53
Pretest and Posttest Analyses 53
Interviews Analyses 66
Field Experience Activity Logs 75
Classroom Observations 77
Summary of Data Analyses 80

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 82

Summary of the Study 82
Conclusions 85
Recommendations for Further Research 89

APPENDIX 93

LIST OF REFERENCES 97

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 102

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. Experimental and Control Subjects' Intended Teaching Level and Number of Classes Taken 41

2. TCCL-B and PCI Pretest and Posttest Internal Reliability Estimates 44

3. Analysis of Variance Results on Pretest and Posttest Self Subscale 55

4. Group Mean Scores on Pretest and Posttest Self Subscale . . 56

5. Analysis of Variance Results on Pretest and Posttest Task Subscale 58

6. Pretest and Posttest Group Means for the Treatment by Teaching Level Interaction on the Task Subscale 59

7. Analysis of Variance Results on Pretest and Posttest Impact Subscale 61

8. Pretest and Posttest Group Impact Means for the Interactions Teaching Level by Classes Taken and Treatment by Teaching Level 62

9. Analysis of Variance Results on Pretest and Posttest Control Subscale 64

10. Pretest and Posttest Group Control Means for the Interaction Treatment by Teaching Level 65

11. Analysis of Variance Results on Interview Self Subscale Scores 67

12. Interview Subscale Means 68

13. Analysis of Variance Results on Interview Task Subscale Scores 70

14. Analysis of Variance Results on Interview Subscale Scores . 72

15. Analysis of Variance Results on Interview Control Subscale Scores 74

16. Mean Weights Assigned to Categories of Experiences 76

17. Partial Correlation of Logs with Posttest Subscale Scores . 77

18. Subjects' Observed and Posttested Scores for Each Subscale 78

19. Subjects' Observed and Posttested Rankings and Correlations for Each Subscale 79

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

THE EFFECTS OF AN EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE UPON THE TEACHING CONCERNS AND PUPIL CONTROL ORIENTATIONS OF BEGINNING PRESERVICE TEACHERS

By

Lila L. Buchanan

December, 1981

Chairman: Dr. William D. Hedges
Major Department: Curriculum and Instruction

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant differences in beginning preservice teachers' concerns about teaching and pupil control orientations are related to an Early Field Experience. Teaching concerns included concerns with the Self as teacher, the Tasks of teaching, and the Impact of teaching upon pupil learning. Orientations to pupil control were the extent of preservice teachers' desires to exert control over pupil behavior. Additional areas of investigation included the relationship between concerns and control orientations and field experiences and the relationship between tested and observed concerns and control orientations.

The study employed random placement into experimental and control groups of the 78 beginning preservice teachers enrolled in two introductory education courses at the University of Central Florida. The experimental treatment was a 16 hour, elementary level, variable field experience. Subjects were pre- and posttested on the Teacher Concerns Check List, Form B and Pupil Control Ideology Form. Data were also collected through interviews, field experience activity logs, and classroom observation of a sample of experimental subjects.

Data were analyzed by analysis of variance, Partial Correlation, and Spearman Rank Difference Method. Variables were the field experience, subjects' intended teaching levels, and number of introductory education courses being taken.

Data analyses indicated no significant differences in Self, Task, Impact, and Control concerns related to the field experiences. On the Self and Control concerns, the interaction of treatment and intended teaching level produced significant differences. The field experience log scores had low relationships with posttest scores on all subscales. The relationship between the sample of experimental subjects' observed and posttested concerns was moderate on Self, Task, and Control concerns and low on Impact concerns.

Conclusions were that differences in teaching concerns and pupil control orientations are not related to this 16 hour field experience. When combined with the field experience, the subjects' intended teaching levels were influential in affecting Self and Control concerns. The field experience content did not make a difference in concerns or control orientations. The 16 hour field experience was judged to be of insufficient strength to effect real differences in teaching concerns and control orientations.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

This study investigated effects of an Early Field Experience upon preservice teachers' concerns about teaching. The questions asked were:

1. Will beginning preservice teachers express different concerns about teaching after having a classroom field experience than do beginning preservice teachers who have not had a classroom field experience? Specifically,
    - A. Will there be differences in concerns with themselves as teachers?
    - B. Will there be differences in concerns about the tasks of teaching?
    - C. Will there be differences in concerns about the impact of teaching upon learning?
2. Will beginning preservice teachers express different orientations to pupil control after having a classroom field experience than do beginning preservice teachers with no classroom field experience?

Rationale

Recent surveys suggest the practice of including pre-student teaching classroom experiences in teacher education programs has become fairly widespread (Howey, Yarger, & Joyce, 1978; Van Patton, 1977). Studies reviewed in Chapter II indicate effects of pre-student teaching field experiences upon the preservice teacher. However, according to Seiforth and Samuel (1979), insufficient research has been conducted to warrant the conclusion that field experiences prior to student teaching contribute to superior teaching; the authors suggest experimentation is needed on early, experiential preparation components. In supporting the need for additional research, Zeichner (1980) cautions against the assumption that merely adding classroom experience to a teacher education curriculum contributes to the development of better teachers. He asserts that not enough is known about the effects of such experiences upon preservice teachers. This study sought to address both pleas and to contribute to the existing knowledge about the effects of field experiences in the initial stages of a teacher education program.

Fuller Introduced the concept of teaching concerns as being felt needs to act to answer questions and resolve perceived problems related to teaching (Fuller, 1969). She theorized that maturity in teaching develops in stages and is reflected by the content of concerns expressed by teachers (Fuller, 1969; Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1973). The concept of teaching concerns has been investigated using preservice teachers involved in a first course field experience (Harp, 1974). While both studies indicated the classroom experience was related to development of mature teaching concerns, the authors called for additional research. Both studies used small samples composed of volunteers, and neither used a control group. Fuller and Bown (1975) called for research on the concerns of preservice teachers early in a preparation program in order that experiences could be developed to resolve the expressed concerns. This study was designed to clarify the concerns of beginning preservice teachers by using students randomly placed into experimental and control groups.

The study of beginning preservice teachers' concerns about teaching also examined differences in pupil control orientations as a result of an Early Field Experience. Not only is research on beginning preservice teachers' teaching concerns limited, but few studies have been located which investigate Willower, Eidell, and Hoy's (1967) concept of Pupil Control Ideologies of beginning preservice teachers and the extent to which their orientations are affected by first classroom experiences. Ross (1980) examined pupil control orientations of all students in one program who were taking a field experience to determine whether the amount of previous field experience affected differences in humanism or custodialism. While students with no previous field experience were found to have the greatest changes in orientation, Ross did not use a control group, and he investigated the single variable of amount of field experience. Willower et al. (1967) proposed that schools are more frequently custodial than humanistic, that the concept of orientation to humanism or custodialism is related to the concept of socialization into a classroom's or schools' disciplinary norms and standards. However, Zeichner (1980) has suggested numerous influences outside the classroom may be at work to affect a preservice teacher's orientation to pupil control. Whether or not first experiences in a classroom teacher role affect pupil control orientations seems an important question. This study was designed to provide information on the development of pupil control orientations through comparisons of groups both with and without first experiences in a teacher's role.

The theory of development of teaching concerns and the concept of orientation to pupil control imply the psychological underpinning of motivation. To study what concerns beginning preservice teachers and their degrees of humanism or custodialism is to study what beginners want to know, what they perceive they need to know, and what their attention may be focused upon in a classroom. Gaining information on how an Early Field Experience affects teaching concerns and ideas about pupil control seems equivalent to gaining insight about the value of an Early Field Experience with respect to its motivational and developmental influence. This study was designed to provide further understanding of the effects of the experience on beginning preservice teachers' concerns about teaching and orientations to pupil control.

Summary of Procedures

This study investigated the teaching concerns of 78 beginning preservice teachers enrolled in two introductory education courses at the University of Central Florida during Spring Quarter, 1981. The courses were Analysis of Teaching and Classroom Management and Learning which students may take concurrently at the beginning of their programs.

The students were randomly placed into experimental and control groups according to a table of random numbers. The experimental subjects were assigned to an eight week field experience consisting of serving for two hours a week in Orange County elementary schools. The content of subjects' experiences varied from simple observing to limited small group or whole class teaching. The control group subjects were assigned to library research projects.

Data were collected by means of pre- and posttesting on two self report instruments, interviews with each subject, field experience logs of activities from the experimental group, and observation of a sample of the experimental subjects as they participated in their field experiences. The self report instruments were Teacher Concerns Check List, Form B (George, Borich, & Fuller, 1974) (TCCL-B) and the Pupil

Control Ideology Form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967) (PCI). Each instrument is a Likert style, five response format designed to measure the intensity of the response. The interviews and classroom observations were designed to validate the subjects' stages of concerns and orientations to pupil control. Data from the interviews and observations were transferred to coding sheets developed to tap the focus of concerns expressed and orientations to pupil control within each statement made by the subjects. In order to examine the specifics of the Early Field Experiences, the subjects kept logs of their in-school activities including the number of times they participated in an activity and the amount of time spent in each activity.

Several statistical procedures were used to analyze the TCCL-B and PCI pre- and posttest scores, the interviews, the field experience logs, and the classroom observations. An analysis of variance was applied to the TCCL-B and PCI pre- and posttest scores to determine if group differences existed which could be attributable to the field experience and to gain information about the nature of those differences. Independent variables were the field experience or library project as treatment, the number of classes the students took in which the treatment was assigned, and the intended teaching level of the beginning preservice teachers. An analysis of variance using the same independent variables was applied to the interview data with the goal again being to determine differences between groups and the effect of the independent variables.

The field experience logs and the classroom observation data were taken from the experimental group only. In order to ascertain relationships between the experimental groups' TCCL-B and PCI posttest scores and the experiences they had in the schools, scores reflecting the quality of their experiences were derived from their logs and correlated with their posttest scores. A rank difference correlation procedure was applied to the classroom observation data to determine the relationship between the sample of preservice teachers' concerns expressed during their field experiences and their rankings on the expressed concerns.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study assumed that anyone taking a beginning education course has an interest in teaching and education and that a particular academic or grade level interest does not interfere with acquiring general knowledge about the way in which teachers and pupils behave in a live classroom setting. The study also assumed that students, before taking a first field experience, have a vision or "map" of teaching and learning which is based upon their own framework of experiences as students and results in an idealized view of a teacher's role. The first field experiences are assumed to provide a realistic perception of the teacher's role and initiate the development of self-images in this role. The study further assumed that concerns of preservice teachers about teaching and beliefs about pupil control could be measured by the instruments selected and that the subjects responding to the instruments did so to the extent they were able at the time of such responses.

The study was limited by the number of subjects included and factors relating to their experiences. Of the 78 subjects included, 40 had the experimental treatment of the field experiences. This limited number of subjects had the opportunity for only 16 hours per subject of field experience because of the constraints imposed by the academic courses with which the experiences were integrated. Furthermore, these experiences were probably influenced by the public school cooperating teachers and pupils in the classrooms in ways perhaps not anticipated nor clearly definable. While every effort was made to control types and amounts of experiences, unexpected events in the lives of the subjects or in the classrooms, themselves, may have left impressions on the subjects not accounted for by the study. Therefore, all data were interpreted in the context of these limitations, and generalizations were made accordingly. However, one major strength of this study is that students were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions were applied:

Early Field Experience (EFE)--Referred to a public school classroom volunteer experience which was integrated with an introductory education course. The term implies the experience was had at the beginning of a prospective teacher's preparation program.

Self concerns--Referred to concerns for one's own survival and adequacy in the classroom with respect to being able to discipline a class, to gain mastery over academic content, to doing well when a supervisor is present, to gaining respect of pupils and professional persons (Fuller, 1969, 1971; Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1973). The term was also used to indicate a scale for the measurement of these concerns.

Task concerns--Referred to concerns for the tasks of teaching with respect to worries such as pressures upon teachers, the routine and inflexibility of teaching situations, the rapid rate of curriculum and instructional change, and having to perform too many noninstructional duties (Fuller, 1969, 1971; Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1973). The term was also used to indicate a scale for the measurement of these concerns.

Impact concerns--Referred to concerns for the impact of one's teaching upon pupil learning with respect to such conerns as increasing pupils' feelings of accomplishment, meeting the needs of different kinds of pupils, diagnosing pupil learning problems, guiding pupils toward intellectual and emotional growth (Fuller, 1969, 1971; Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1973). The term was also used to indicate a scale for the measurement of these concerns.

Pupil control orientation--Referred to the position a preservice teacher takes with respect to the amount of constraint necessary to place upon pupil behavior in order to maintain sufficient classroom discipline to enable effective teaching to occur.

Custodial orientation--Referred to an orientation to pupil control characterized by a teacher's desire for pupils' forced compliance to arbitrary behavioral standards set by teachers and schools. Pupil behavior is viewed in moralistic terms, and teacher-pupil relationships are impersonal with teachers expressing pessimism and watchful mistrust of pupils (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967). The term as used in this study referred also to the measurement of custodial orientation.

Humanistic orientation--Referred to an orientation to pupil control characterized by viewing behavior in socio-psychological terms rather than moralistic terms. This orientation expects the pupil to be self-disciplining and stresses the importance of the individual's needs and interests and patterns of growth. This orientation uses supportive, understanding, and non-punitive measures to achieve behavior norms (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967).

Summary and Preview

This chapter studied the effects of an EFE upon the concerns about teaching and pupil control orientations of beginning preservice teachers. The need for this study arose from a general need for additional research on pre-student teaching field experiences and from a particular need to define teaching concerns and pupil control orientations of beginning preservice teachers in order that the prospective teachers' concerns development can be ascertained as a result of having participated in an EFE. This chapter outlined procedures for the study, stated the assumptions upon which the study was based and the limitations placed upon the conclusions, and defined the terms of the study.

Chapter II discusses the research related to pre-student teaching field experiences and the research and development of the theory of teaching concerns and pupil control orientations. Chapter II also discusses the development of the TCCL-B and PCI used to gather pre- and posttest data.

Chapter III describes the methodology of the study. The emphases are on the population sample, experimental treatment, and the procedures used in collecting and analyzing the data.

Chapter IV reports the specific results obtained from all the statistical procedures used to analyze the data. The chapter describes the results both in narrative and tabular form.

Chapter V discusses the results reported and draws conclusions based upon the results. The chapter also includes recommendations for future EFE programs and offers suggestions for additional research.

CHAPTER II
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

For years the initial classroom experience for a teacher in training came during the trainee's final program phase. Theoretically, this period gave the student the opportunity through actual teaching to practice what had been learned up to that time. In recent years initial classroom experience in the form of observation and teacher assistance has been included in a program's methods phase and even in introductory courses for the purpose of instilling in the student an awareness of both theory and practice.

Research on initial, pre-student teaching field experiences suggests variable effects upon the preservice teacher. This chapter reviews research of initial classroom experiences; it focuses upon the research related to the development of teaching concerns and pupil control orientations and includes studies in the development of instrumentation to measure concerns and pupil control ideologies.

Initial, Pre-student Teaching Field Experience Effects

Whether occurring in the context of introductory education or methods courses, the values of initial, pre-student teaching field experiences have been examined from many perspectives. Few consistent conclusions emerge, but results indicate leads regarding effects upon the preservice teacher.

One finding is participation in a field experience neither enhances nor impedes academic achievement in the course with which the experience is integrated. Hedberg (1979), Clarke (1974), Ingle and Robinson (1965), and Marso (1971) studied differences in course achievement between groups assigned varying field experiences and those with no field assignment and found the school experiences seemingly neither contributed to nor interfered with final exam scores or course grades. Hedberg's and Ingle and Robinson's experimental groups had less university classroom instruction than the control groups, but the difference did not deter achievement. Nor did Marso's or Clarke's experimental groups enjoy achievement advantages as a result of spending time in classrooms in addition to university coursework. Apparently, differences in the amount of time spent in campus and field experiences affects neither course nor final exam achievement.

However, Sandefur (1970) studied differences between field and campus groups' pre- and posttest cognitive performance on the National Teacher Examination, finding the campus group scores significantly better on the professional education section and generally better overall. Since his field groups' teaching behaviors had been rated higher than his control groups', Sandefur concluded that possession of factual knowledge does not necessarily commit the teacher to behavioral change.

Clarke (1974) studied field experience effects upon educational philosophies, finding the experimental group changed more toward Idealism and less toward Pragmatism than did the control group without field experience. Over the course of the study, both groups changed significantly toward Existentialism; neither changed positions on

Realism. Clarke concluded that the experimental group was probably affected by two different teaching models, the university and field teachers, and that these, coupled with the realism of participating in public school classrooms, worked to temper their perceptions of what methods would really be effective in teaching.

Bartos (1973) examined perceptions of preservice teachers relating to degrees of humanistic interpersonal relationships resulting from various combinations of field experience and university classroom instruction. While no significant differences in humanistic perceptions were found either within or among groups resulting from combinations of field experience, alone, classroom instruction, alone, or any combination of these, trends indicated that more positive growth occurred when field experience and campus instruction were presented concurrently.

Walberg (1967) tested 1,389 preservice teachers on all academic levels to see how the different stages of education and teaching experience affected self concepts. He found that as students progressed through their programs their self concepts decidedly changed with the student teaching experience having both great and negative effects. Increased education and experience had negative effects on men's self concepts while women, particularly elementary level students, were affected positively. Walberg concluded that the initial teaching experience should be advanced to earlier courses in order to lessen the anxiety and conflict provoked by first teaching experiences.

Sherer (1978) reached the same conclusion in comparing self concepts of students who had participated in a field experience program with students from a more traditional program. Although the two groups' performance ratings did not differ, self concept measures were distinctly different both at the beginning and the end of student teaching. The field group had much more conflict at the beginning, but by the end the differences had been reversed. At that point, the traditional group was experiencing conflict, and the field subjects had apparently resolved theirs. Scherer suggested the early field experience had the effect of advancing the reality shock of teaching in order that such conflict could be minimized or resolved during student teaching.

Several studies have examined the effects of initial field experiences upon attitudes toward teaching and pupils. Results indicate that attitudes usually change but not consistently in one direction.

Melograno (1976) and Crocker (1980) tried to find attitude changes attributable to particular combinations and amounts of early field experiences. While neither study indicated any certain type or amount was most effective in influencing attitude changes, Melograno's preservice teachers all experienced positive changes, leading him to conclude that an early field experience, regardless of its variability, may contribute to desirable attitudes.

Ingle and Robinson (1965) did not find attitude changes resulting from the singular experience of observation. They compared two groups of students, one group assigned to observe teachers and the other group having no field experience. They concluded that a term of classroom observation had no demonstrable, objective advantage for their field group, but it also had done no harm.

Knoll (1973) and Marso (1971) studied the effects of a teacher's aide experience upon attitudes and found both samples of prospective teachers emerged from the field placement terms with significantly more positive attitudes than they had previously held. In analyzing certain demographic variables, Knoll found that freshman and sophomore female elementary preservice students had more positive attitudes than students nearing completion of their programs, particularly students intending to teach on the secondary level. This suggested the need for structuring field experiences to meet individual needs. As a result of his data analysis, Marso recommended early field experiences to enable preservice teachers to make more confident judgments about teaching as a career.

Greene (1972) compared groups of methods students and student teachers to see if their respective field experiences influenced changes in their values, dogmatism, and attitudes toward teaching. While no differences in values and dogmatism were found, the methods group evidenced significantly more positive attitude changes. Greene concluded that methods courses combined with field experiences offer a good opportunity to instill positive attitudes toward teaching and children.

Studying effects of variable field experiences, Kulm (1975) found that early teaching experiences had a dampening effect upon preservice teachers' attitudes toward mathematics teaching while simple classroom observation resulted in more open, modern attitudes. He concluded that field experiences should begin early in a teacher education program but should be carefully selected and structured in order not to create negative effects upon preservice teachers.

Day (1959) studied attitude changes of groups of beginning teachers after their initial teaching experience. One group was tested immediately after student teaching and again a year later while the other group was tested both before and after student teaching. The results indicated the student teaching period and the first year of teaching were associated with a decline in attitudes whereas graduates who had not gone into teaching experienced fairly stable attitudes. Day concluded that the initial teaching experience and its shock effect should be advanced in the training program to allay unrealistic perceptions regarding teaching.

Several studies have investigated the effects of early field experiences on teaching performance. While Crocker (1980) and Scherer (1978) were unable to determine that early experiences are advantageous to teaching performance, other studies have found positive influences.

In an evaluation of an experimental program, Sandefur (1970) compared teaching behaviors of student teachers from field-based, experiential preservice programs with those of students from a traditional, campus based program. Using two classroom observation instruments, he found that the experimental groups' teaching behaviors and patterns and their pupils' behaviors were rated significantly higher than those of the control group. Sandefur concluded that direct involvement in the teaching-learning process prior to student teaching is instrumental in effecting desirable behavioral changes and that prospective teachers can be trained to utilize certain specific teaching behaviors.

Sunal (1980) investigated effects of differing amounts of field experience upon science teaching role behaviors of students during elementary methods courses. Comparing an extended experience group with one having limited field experiences, he found that preservice students with the longer experiences showed significantly more and higher quality teaching behaviors than those with less experience.

Lux (1973) examined differing amounts and types of early field experiences to determine influences on competencies of secondary social studies students. The experimental group in this study participated in numerous field activities while the control group had fewer experiences supplemented with simulated activities. The results indicated the experimental group achieved significantly higher cognitive scores on concepts than the controls, had higher skill ratings, demonstrated instructional behaviors and patterns at a faster rate, and had generally more positive attitudes. The conclusion was the increased field experience appeared to foster a higher level of competency.

Marso and Reed (1971) and Folkert (1977) studied student teachers' teaching behaviors to determine if observable differences existed which could be attributed to early field experiences. Comparing groups with and without prior field experiences, both studies used student teacher self ratings and coordinating and supervising teacher ratings. While Marso and Reed's experimental group was rated significantly higher than the control group on all ratings, Folkert's experimental group was rated higher on only variables of student rapport and professional characteristics.

Another group of studies focuses upon student reactions to their initial field experiences. Generally, students react positively and apparently believe they are better prepared for their next program sequence when they have had in-school experiences.

Foley (1978), Swann (1975), and Gantt and Davey (1972) surveyed preservice teachers from experimental field and traditional programs to determine students' feelings of being prepared to teach. All field experience students reported positive reactions and confidence that the classroom experiences had improved their teaching abilities. Foley's field group had greater awareness of teacher roles and responsibilities and classroom problems than her no experience group while Swann's field group reported greater feelings of security and preparedness in approaching classroom teaching tasks for their next assignments. Gantt and Davey's field group had fewer attitudes of irrelevance toward the methods course with which the field experience was integrated.

Martin (1980) found that student teachers had the more enthusiastic reactions to their early field experiences when compared with students in earlier stages of a teacher education program. The survey addressed students' reactions about their abilities to apply principles demonstrated in an educational psychology course. While students generally approved of the field experience, those taking the earlier courses of educational psychology and methods were less enthusiastic than were the student teachers about the field experience benefits. The conclusion was that the closer students came to being responsible for implementing psychological concepts, the more they appreciated having had the opportunity to practice them in live classroom situations.

In an effort to determine differing values between two types of early field experience programs and their effects upon students' reactions, Ross, Raines, Cervetti, and Dellow (1980) compared a tutoring program with a teacher apprentice program. They surveyed student activities and attitudes at the end of the programs and found more content similarities than differences which reflected the difficulty in structuring programs with precise kinds of experiences. While both programs engendered positive student reactions, the apprentice group felt more positive about their preparation than did the tutoring group. Also, elementary students reacted more positively than did secondary students.

Kleine and Pereira (1970) studied perceptions of what preservice teachers do and do not see in observing classrooms and found student observers spend most of their time watching the teacher instead of students. Apparently, preservice students miss certain important roles a teacher plays. The students in this study spent their time watching teachers' managing and controlling behaviors but failed to recognize the teachers' inspiring and understanding roles. The authors concluded that the observation experience, while valuable, is also limiting since students bring with them only their perceptions of teaching based upon their experiences as students. Not until preservice students have teaching experience are they usually aware of the importance of other things. Therefore, beginning preservice teachers need help in developing new perceptions which will assist them in looking at classrooms in a more revealing way.

In summary, several studies indicate initial, pre-student teaching field experiences, given certain conditions, have some positive effects upon self concept (Scherer, 1978), attitudes (Greene, 1972; Knoll, 1973; Kulm, 1975; Marso, 1971; Melograno, 1976), performance (Lux, 1973; Marso & Reed, 1971; Sandefur, 1970; Sunal, 1980), reactions (Foley, 1978; Gantt & Davey, 1972; Martin, 1980; Ross et al., 1980; Swann, 1975), and do not deter course achievement (Clarke, 1974; Hedberg, 1979; Ingle & Robinson, 1965; Marso, 1971). Other studies found trends toward improvement in relationships (Bartos, 1973) and teaching performance (Folkert, 1977). Still other studies have found that early field experiences either were not advantageous (Crocker, 1980; Ingle & Robinson, 1965), limited perceptions of preservice teachers (Kleine & Pereira, 1970), or changed philosophies of education (Clarke, 1974). When the initial field experience is the final student teaching phase, the effects apparently are anxiety provoking (Day, 1959; Walberg, 1967). One suggestion made by almost all these authors was that some kind of in vivo classroom experience should occur early in a teacher education program although they tend to differ on the nature and structure of such experiences. While these studies have tentatively identified positive benefits of some kinds of early field experiences, other effects, such as the development of concerns about teaching and pupil control, have received scant attention. The next sections address those concepts.

Research and Theory Related to the Development of Concerns of Teachers

During the 1960s, a group of educators at the University of Texas at Austin launched a program of research on the psychological complexities of becoming a teacher. Armed with the perception that feelings and emotions greatly affect the teaching-learning process, these educators studied the preservice teacher as a person, his or her concerns, potentialities, limitations, tasks, and the problems encountered as an individual. The objective of the research was to use the information gained to develop methods to help prospective teachers anticipate classroom and teaching reality and to help them cope with problems before such problems arose (Fuller, Bown, & Peck, 1967).

Fuller and her associates began their research by studying the concerns and questions common to prospective teachers during the subjective experience of becoming a teacher. They focused upon the perimeter of preservice teachers' self awareness and tried to find unknown experiential influences which might limit their teaching and their interactions with pupils. From this study, some common questions emerged which revolved around the beginning teacher's security and adequacy. Not until the teachers could find answers to "Where do I stand in the school?" "How do I maintain order in the classroom?" and "How am I being evaluated?" could they begin to ask the questions related to their own influences on pupil learning. Resolving the first order of questions freed them to ask the second.

Two of the studies conducted during this period illustrate the development of the self-focus conceptualization. In one (Fuller, 1969), student teachers were given weekly individual counseling instead of the traditional student teaching seminar. Over a period of three semesters, the counseling sessions were audio taped, and the types of expressed concerns were tabulated. The results indicated all three groups had a similar focus of concerns. During the first three weeks in each semester, the student teachers were mostly concerned with themselves. They wanted to talk about the parameters of the school situation which affected them and their work, and they wanted to discuss classroom discipline. Their focus was self-protection and self-adequacy. While these students continued their self concerns throughout most of the semesters, near the end of the period, the emphases shifted to concerns with pupils and how teachers can better assist pupil learning progress.

In order to clarify these data and determine if the conclusions should be attributed to other factors, a second study (Fuller, 1969) investigated student teacher concerns by having the student teachers respond in writing to the statement, "When you think about your teaching, what are you concerned about now?" The students wrote about their concerns after each two week period of their student teaching. The tabulation of concerns was similar to the first study and supported the dichotomy between self and pupil concerns.

To determine the content of teaching concerns prior to initial teaching experiences, Fuller (1969) counseled 41 sophomore and junior education students before they had any contact with pupils and classrooms in a teacher role. While these preservice students expressed problems and concerns, the content was generally vague and related to anticipation and apprehension about teaching. The expressed concerns were seemingly based upon hearsay, for the students did not appear to know just what should concern them. In discussing ideas about teaching, the students related their own experiences as pupils. The conclusion was the pre-teaching phase was a period of non-concern with the specifics of teaching.

One of the reasons suggested for student non-concern was a lack of motivation to know. Aware that students traditionally find education courses irrelevant, Fuller considered that preservice teachers had no need to know answers to educational questions until their own experiences motivated them to seek such answers. Thus, traditional education courses may very well be answering questions that students are not asking. Therefore, the concept of teacher concern was defined as a felt need to do something, a motivation to seek resolution of that need.

In order to find either contradiction or support for the student teacher self-focus and pupil focus dichotomy, the Texas educators reviewed relevant research reporting problems of student teachers and beginning inservice teachers (Fuller, 1969). While only two studies of experienced teacher problems could be found, an analysis of data from those and 10 selected studies centering on student and beginning inservice teacher problems supported the idea that beginning teachers are primarily concerned with self-adequacy and that with experience, this focus changes to more concern with pupil learning.

Based upon the evidence from the Texas studies and the data analysis from the literature review, Fuller (1969) conceptualized teaching maturity as a reflection of the teacher's focus of concern and that this maturity develops according to experience in three phases: pre-teaching, early teaching, and late teaching. The pre-teaching phase is a non-concern phase based upon generalizations about teaching. The early teaching phase was characterized as a concern with self and one's survival and adequacy in evaluation. The late teaching phase was considered to focus upon the more mature concerns about pupil learning.

Fuller theorized that advancement from one phase to another could occur by arousing and then resolving concerns and that students could not advance to pupil concerns until questions about self were answered (Fuller, 1971). The key to facilitating the development from one phase to another was motivating the need to know through the use of personalized processes such as counseling, videotaped teaching experiences, and classroom experience. Students in the pre-teaching phase needed to become aware of concerns they should have, and through these various techniques they could adopt concerns prior to student teaching. Therefore, through early arousal and resolution, persons entering student teaching would be freer to address pupil learning, being less focused upon themselves.

To test the hypothesis that early teaching experience can arouse concerns and motivate the student to resolve them, Newlove and Fuller (1971) studied beginning preservice teachers' concerns after a 15 minute, first teaching experience. Each of 23 juniors taught an English lesson to eighth or ninth graders. Each lesson was videotaped, and each student viewed the tape and was counseled for one hour following the lesson. The teachers were rated on certain behavioral characteristics by the pupils taught and by the coordinating and supervising teachers, and this feedback was discussed with the students. The student teachers' concerns and reactions expressed during counseling were analyzed for their focus. The results indicated that the brief teaching experience was helpful in awakening the students to specific tasks of teaching and inspiring their interest in learning more about teaching.

A test of the arousal and resolution hypothesis investigated the effects of a first course field experience in facilitating concern development (Harp, 1974). Beginning preservice teachers served for a term as classroom aides and assisted in instructional responsibilities. At three intervals during the teaching period, they responded in writing about their current concerns. Results indicated a significant development in teacher concerns from self at the beginning of the experience to pupil needs at the end, suggesting that facilitating maturation of concerns is possible before students progress very far in teacher education programs.

To test further the bipolarity of the teacher concern continuum from self to pupils, 1,293 preservice and inservice teachers were given a written, open-ended statement to complete which asked them to discuss in writing what were their most pressing current concerns about teaching (Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1973). While the instrument was found to have serious psychometric limitations in scoring procedures, the differences in concerns between preservice and inservice teachers seemed clear. Even though both groups of teachers expressed concerns about both self and pupils, the emphasis of focus was different. Inservice teachers were more frequently concerned about pupil learning needs while preservice teachers were more frequently concerned about self needs. These findings were considered to support the proposition that pupil learning concerns were more mature since they were characteristic of experienced teachers.

A factor analysis of the categorized responses suggested three separate and distinct stages beyond the non-concern, pre-teaching phase. Concerns related to teaching performance appeared to be distinctly different from self and pupil benefit concerns. While preservice teachers did not distinguish between teaching performance and pupil learning, experienced teachers expressed two different areas of concern: task performance and pupil learning. Some teachers mentioned problems with the tasks of teaching such as relating to students' lives certain curriculum content and with presenting lessons effectively. Defined as teaching task concerns, these problems were found to be a factor separate from pupil learning concerns which revolved around worries about pupil learning and whether or not pupil needs were being met. Therefore, a reconceptualization of concern phases was found necessary. The developmental process now included three stages beyond the pre-teaching, non-concern phase. These stages were labeled Self, Task, and Impact (pupil learning).

In summary, the theory of teachers' concerns about teaching proposes that maturity of teacher concerns is a developmental process which first must be initiated and then occurs in three stages. First is the self survival stage typical of education students with little teaching experience. Concerned about themselves, preservice students have questions related to class control, doing well when a supervisor is present, their role in the school, and being evaluated. This stage is also characteristic of beginning teachers. The second stage is related to performance in teaching and requires some teaching experience to recognize. The questions typical of this stage are those reflecting concerns with the teaching situation such as lack of instructional materials, too many students to teach, and curriculum and instructional changes. The third stage, called Impact, is reached after the concerns of the first two stages have been resolved. The third stage is concerned with pupil learning and how that occurs. Questions typical of this stage refer to diagnosing pupil learning problems, appropriately challenging the unmotivated pupil, and meeting pupils' learning needs. The theory states that teacher concerns relate to particular stages and, once aroused, the concerns must be resolved before the teacher can be free to move to the next stage.

Research on the Development of Instrumentation to Measure Teacher Concerns

The data upon which the concerns theory was first based came from categorizations of concerns taken from tape recordings of counseling sessions and from written statements of concerns (Fuller, 1969). Efforts to be more systematic led to development of a categorical coding system to be used with an open-ended questionnaire entitled The Teacher Concerns Statement (Fuller & Case, 1971). When this instrument was tested on over 1,500 preservice and inservice teachers, problems with scoring procedures related to coder reliability and weaknesses in the coding system's distinguishing powers suggested the need for a machine scorable instrument in order to increase the ease and decrease the cost accompanying the collection of raw data (Fuller & Parsons, 1972). Therefore, 56 Likert scaled items were developed, each one of which described a teaching concern which was considered to be representative of one of the five categories used in scoring The Teacher Concerns Statement. Called The Teacher Concern Checklist, the first version instructed the respondent to check one of five agreement responses from "Yes, a lot" to "No, not concerned" indicating the extent to which the person was concerned with the topic mentioned in the item. After administering this instrument to 95 undergraduate education majors at the University of Texas at Austin, the authors considered a revision in the response categories necessary. Therefore, Form B (TCCL-B) was identical to the original form except that the response categories were changed to reflect a single intensity-related dimension. The five changed responses ranged from "Extremely Concerned" to "Not Concerned at All." This form was then administered to

335 preservice teachers and 345 inservice teachers (George, Borich, & Fuller, 1974). Administrations of the instrument were given to additional preservice and inservice teachers and to school principals for a total sample of 1,109 persons (584 preservice teachers, 443 inservice teachers, and 82 principals) (George, 1978). Factor analyses of the responses were applied both to the samples separately and to the group as a whole. Each analysis revealed several factors, but three consistently emerged which supported the concerns theory. These were considered to be the factors related to concerns about pupil learning, termed Impact, concerns about the self, termed Self, and concerns about teaching tasks, termed Task. The analysis revealed that some of the items were found to be ambiguous and did not discriminate among the three factors. Therefore, those items which had either low or equal loadings on each factor were subject to elimination from the scale.

Thirty items with the highest factor loadings, 10 from each factor, were tested for internal consistency. Factor one, Impact, had an alpha coefficient of .91 with a standard error of 2; factor two, Self, had an alpha .86 with S = 2.5; and factor three, Task, had an alpha .79 with S = 3.0. One week test-retest reliability coefficients for 44 preservice teachers revealed Impact had .77; Self had .87; and Task had .80 (George et al., 1974).

The primary evidence for the instrument's validity is in the form of construct validity or the extent to which scores from different groups of teachers conform to the theoretical predictions of their concerns. The theory predicts that preservice teachers should have higher self concerns than inservice teachers and that inservice teachers should have higher Task and Impact concerns than preservice teachers.

When the strength of the concerns for each subscale was tested for different populations, the theory was supported on Self and Task subscales but not for Impact. Preservice and inservice teachers had significantly different scores with preservice having higher Self concerns and inservice teachers having higher Task concerns. Significance levels were lower than .01. However, differences with respect to Impact scores were not significant (George, 1978). Frequency tabulations of concerns with differing populations were similar. Preservice teachers expressed Self concerns more frequently than Task concerns, and inservice teachers expressed Task concerns more frequently than Self concerns. Even though both groups had equally high expressions of Impact concerns, for preservice teachers Impact and Task concerns increased with student teaching while Self concerns decreased, thus supporting the theory (George et al., 1974).

In summary, after numerous developments in measuring concerns, the 30 items on the TCCL-B with the highest factor loadings seem to have sufficient reliability to be used with a preservice population and sufficient construct validity with respect to Self and Task scales. However, the Impact scales remain questionable. Whether the inability to support validity of the Impact scale results from weaknesses in the instrument's discriminating power or stems from weaknesses in the theory, itself, remains unclear. Regardless of the reason, knowledge about preservice teachers' concerns is desirable in order to structure preservice teaching experiences which will answer the questions preservice teachers should realize the need to ask.

Research and Theory Related to Pupil Control Ideology

One of the survival concerns of preservice teachers is discipline or order in the classroom. Studies (Fuller, 1969; Jones & Harty, 1980; Ross, 1980; Thompson, 1963; Travers, Rabinowitz, & Nemovichore, 1952) indicate that concerns with maintaining pupil control are related both to worry about how much and what type of control is necessary to maintain appropriate teaching-learning interactions and relationships. At some point in a teacher's professional life, the ideas held about pupil control become synthesized into an ideology which Abbott (1965) suggests is an important intervening variable in structuring behavior and providing an internal guide to action.

In conceptualizing teachers' pupil control ideologies, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) borrowed from Gilbert and Levinson (1957) the client control ideology of mental hospital personnel as being at opposite ends of a continuum from custodialism to humanism. When related to the public schools, teachers who hold an extreme custodial orientation conceive of the school as an autocratic organization with a rigid teacher-pupil status hierarchy. The flow of power and communication is unilateral and downward. Pessimism and watchful mistrust characterize the perspective, and rigid control is the central concern. Contrastingly, the humanistic extreme considers the school an educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience. Self-discipline is substituted for strict teacher control, and students are treated as individuals with a wide range of social and psychological needs.

Willower et al. (1967) theorized that schools as institutional organizations with unselected clients have a subculture of beliefs, norms, and perspectives which covertly encourage a particular ideology and bring the participants' beliefs into line with those of the organization. Such a subculture is determined by the official tasks of a school, by community expectations, and by role demands within the organizational hierarchy. Its pressures are particularly exerted and most felt by those having the most direct responsibility for and the closest contact with learning, the teachers. With this conceptual framework, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy proposed a direct relationship between the perceived threat posed by pupils to teacher status and the tendency of teachers to adopt a custodial pupil control ideology.

To test their theory, Willower et al. (1967) hypothesized that teachers would be more custodial than principals, that elementary teachers and principals were less custodial than those on the secondary level, and that teachers with more than five years of experience would be more custodial than those with less than five years. The PCI Form was completed by 1,306 Pennsylvania teachers, principals, and counselors. Using a t test for difference between the means, PCI scores were compared for each hypothesis. All were confirmed at the .001 level. The authors concluded that support had been found for their theory that a relationship exists between organizational position and educators' pupil control ideologies.

If schools are more frequently custodial than humanistic, then teachers experience a double socialization process (Hoy, 1967). During their preservice programs, teachers are often taught ideal images with respect to pupil control, and authoritarian discipline as it exists in many public school classrooms is not regarded positively. Thus, the first socialization process exists through gaining perceptions of what schools should be like. This is the world of preservice education. The second phase is when new teachers enter the reality of the classroom as professional members of the organization. Suddenly the neophyte may be confronted with a different set of norms and values resulting in role conflict for the new teacher.

When preservice teachers serve in the public schools, the conflict between campus taught pupil control orientations and the ideologies of the inservice teacher may be especially dramatic. Based upon this idea, Hoy (1967) hypothesized that student teachers would become more custodial in their pupil control ideologies during student teaching. The results of pre- and posttesting 282 student teachers during an eight week student teaching period tended to confirm the hypothesis related to both elementary and secondary student teachers and supported the assumption that the subculture of the public schools would emphasize a more custodial orientation than that acquired by the students during their college preparation and that through the process of socialization, the student teachers would conform to the values of the schools. Subsequent studies (Hoy, 1968, 1969; Hoy & Rees, 1977) confirmed these findings leading to the conclusion that "the forces of bureaucratic socialization seem strong and efficient" (Hoy & Rees, 1977, p. 25).

Jones and Harty (1980) examined the relationship betwen the amount of time spent in teaching and the pupil control ideologies of student teachers. Results of testing 19 secondary level student teachers indicated a significant, positive correlation between individual scores and the number of hours spent in actual teaching. Thus, the more time spent in teaching tasks, the more custodial became the pupil control orientations. The finding suggested to the authors that the reality of teaching tended to orient prospective teachers more toward controlling a class than being concerned about a humanistic environment. The relationship between time spent teaching and an orientation to custodialism also led to the conclusion that prospective teachers may possess humanistic ideologies but not have the skills and knowledge to implement these kinds of approaches. When this lack of knowledge is coupled with demands for attention to pupil behavior problems and a somewhat conservative cooperating teacher, the student is likely to adopt the control ideology of that teacher.

Ross (1980) examined the effect an early field experience had on the control ideologies of preservice teachers to determine if the experience resulted in a change in their orientations. Dividing his sample of 273 education students into beginning, continuing, and graduating groups, Ross found that overall the field experience significantly affected the students' ideologies. The beginning group, those with no previous field experience, was most affected. Secondary level trainees became significantly more custodial after eight weeks of fieldwork, and elementary level trainees became more humanistic. Variables such as age, sex, and previous teaching experience did not make a significant difference. Ross concluded that the field experience had its greatest impact upon those students in the initial stages of their preservice program and that the fieldwork seemed to be a mechanism that helped preservice teachers adapt to the organizational role demands of the teaching profession.

This socialization process has been frequently attributed to the influence of the cooperating teacher. A multitude of studies about attitude changes during student teaching tends to support the idea that the intern adopts the attitudes of the cooperating teacher over the course of the experience and that the cooperating teacher is the cause of this convergence (e.g., Johnson, 1969; Mahan & Lacefield, 1978; Price, 1961; Seperson & Joyce, 1973). Other studies suggest socializing influences are at work beyond the cooperating teacher. Wright and Tuska (1968) concluded psychological needs which first motivated the students to turn to teaching were of primary influence in the students' role performance rather than the cooperating teachers' modeling. Furthermore, when conflict existed, the reason was attributed to the fact that practice teaching is not real teaching with its incumbent responsibilities. Copeland (1980, 1978) and Doyle (1977) found evidence that the ecological environment of the classroom, itself, which includes direct forces of pupil behavior as well as the values and standards of the school may be working to exert influence on both the cooperating and student teachers. It would appear, therefore, the cooperating teacher may not be the most significant socializing influence on the student teacher. Indeed, Sorenson and Halpert (1968) found that one of the most important sources of stress in teaching was what they termed "dislike of pupils" resulting from lack of experience in dealing with behavior problems. When this source and conflicts with their cooperating teachers persisted, the student teachers decided not to pursue teaching as a career.

Other authors suggest still other influences. Lortie (1975) believed the student teachers' thousands of hours spent as students result in an internalization of teaching models which is the major influence in determining how the teacher conceptualizes the teaching role and its performance. He believed formal training has little effect in altering earlier established conservative views. Giroux (1980) believed the effect of teacher education programs on prospective teachers is neither liberal nor neutral as is commonly believed but is, in fact, supportive of existing patterns in the schools.

Whatever is the shaping influence, be it the cooperating teacher, classroom pupils, student teacher biographies, teacher education programs, or some combination of these, knowledge of the pupil control ideology of beginning education students and whether an early field experience influences that ideology seems important to have in order for teacher educators to provide learning opportunities which will mitigate possible negative effects of field experiences on beginning education students. Such study is consistent with Zeichner's (1980) plea for close examinations of the effects of field experiences.

Development of the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI)

To determine the extent to which educators are custodial or humanistic, the PCI Form was developed by Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) at Pennsylvania State University. The instrument has 20 items with a Likert scaled five response category format ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree."

The original 58 statements were modified many times through pilot testing, and 38 items emerged for further refinement with teachers from seven Pennsylvania and New York elementary and secondary schools. One hundred seventy usable returns were collected for analysis.

Using biserial correlation techniques, an item analysis was completed to determine the discriminating power of each statement. The results of the analysis indicated 20 items had sufficient discriminating power to be included in the final form. The biserial coefficient of correlation for each of the 20 items retained was greater than .325. The theoretical range of scores on the final instrument was 20 to 100, the higher the score, the more custodial the pupil control ideology.

Split half reliability coefficients for the final version of the PCI with the pilot sample of 170 were .91, using the Pearson product-moment formula and .95 by the Spearman-Brown formula. Because these correlations were relatively high, further reliability calculations were made using 55 teachers from one elementary and one secondary school. The Pearson product-moment correlation of the half-test scores produced a coefficient of .83, and application of the Spearman-Brown formula yielded a corrected coefficient of .91. From these data, the authors concluded that the PCI was a relatively reliable measure of educators' pupil control ideologies.

The primary validation procedure was to compare principals' judgments about certain of their teachers' pupil control ideologies to those teachers' PCI scores. Using principals' judgments and teachers' scores from 10 elementary and 4 secondary schools, a t test of the difference of the means was applied to test the prediction that teachers judged to hold a custodial ideology would differ in mean PCI scores from teachers judged to have a humanistic ideology. Using a one-tailed test, the results indicated the predicted differences were significant at the .001 level.

Summary

This review has examined research on effects of initial, pre-student teaching field experiences upon preservice teachers, research and development of the teacher concerns theory, and research and theory on development of pupil control ideologies. The development of instrumentation to measure teacher concerns and pupil control ideologies has also been presented.

Studies indicate pre-student teaching field experiences positively affect self concept (Scherer, 1978), attitudes (Greene, 1972; Knoll, 1973; Kulm, 1975; Marso, 1971; Melograno, 1976), performance (Lux, 1973; Marso & Reed, 1971; Sandefur, 1970; Sunal, 1980), reactions (Foley, 1978; Gantt & Davey, 1972; Martin, 1980; Ross et al., 1980; Swann, 1975) and do not deter course achievement (Clarke, 1974; Hedberg, 1979; Ingle & Robinson, 1965; Marso, 1971). Some studies found the field experience to have either no advantage (Crocker, 1980; Ingle & Robinson, 1965) or to have possible disadvantages (Day, 1959; Kleine & Pereira, 1970; Walberg, 1967).

Fuller's (1969; Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1973) theory of the development of teaching concerns states that maturity in teaching occurs in three stages and that maturity is reflected in the content of teaching concerns expressed by teachers. The stages of maturity refer to concerns focused upon self survival, concerns focused upon teaching tasks, and concerns focused upon the impact of teaching upon pupil learning. Teachers progress from one stage to the next when and if the concerns of their current stage are resolved. Limited evidence exists that initial classroom experiences can evoke mature concerns with preservice teachers (Harp, 1974; Newlove & Fuller, 1971). The TCCL-B, a self-report instrument in a Likert format, has been developed to measure stages of concern.

A particular concern of preservice teachers is pupil control. Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) theorized that the position a teacher takes on a continuum of humanism to custodialism is a function of the socialization process into a school's norms and standards. Hoy (1967) asserted that a preservice teacher experiences a double socialization process, one during preservice preparation and one during the first year a teacher is employed. However, other authors consider a teacher's pupil control orientation may be a function of the preservice teacher's own psychological needs (Wright & Tuska, 1968), personal histories as pupils (Lortie, 1975), the ecological environment of the classroom (Copeland, 1978, 1980; Doyle, 1977), or from dislike of pupils (Sorenson & Halpert, 1968). An instrument developed to measure pupil control orientations is the PCI.

Implications for needed research have emerged from these studies. Diversities in findings with respect to the values of early field experiences suggest additional study is needed particularly in light of the emergence of first course field experiences throughout the country (Gantt & Davey, 1972). In view of the need to structure the most worthwhile EFE's, to study them in terms of their arousal and resolution of teacher concerns and their effects upon pupil control orientations seems a worthy pursuit.

CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methods and procedures selected to study beginning preservice teachers' concerns about teaching and their orientations to pupil control. Description of the two group experimental study includes details about subjects' group placement and the populations' characteristics, details of the arrangement and conduct of the field experiences, procedures used for data collection, and the procedures used for data analyses.

Subjects

Placement into Groups

The study was conducted during the 10 week Spring Quarter, 1981, at the University of Central Florida (UCF) in Orlando, Florida. The subjects were students registered in daytime sections of two introductory education courses, EDF 3603, Analysis of Teaching, and EDF 3255, Classroom Management and Learning. Four class sections of each course were offered; seven different instructors taught the courses. The curriculum for each course was standardized with respect to textbook and competencies to be achieved.

During the first class session of each course, the students were informed by the writer of the research in which they would be involved. All students in attendance were given two forms to complete. One was the Personal Data Sheet (see Appendix) which requested information about the students' intended teaching levels, their reasons for taking the course, the class section(s) for which they were registered, and information related to their previous teaching experiences, if any. The other form contained the Teacher Concerns Check List, Form B (TCCL-B) and the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI). This combined instrument served as the pretest.

From the Personal Data Sheets, students were selected to be included in the study as follows: Students who had had paid teaching experience or more than 10 hours of volunteer teacher aide experience within the past year were excluded because they were considered to have already had an Early Field Experience (EFE). In all, 85 subjects were selected to be included in the study. These subjects were then placed, using a table of random numbers, into Project A (Experimental Group) or Project B (Control Group), totaling 43 and 42 respectively.

During the second class session of each course, the students were given their group assignments. The experimental subjects were each assigned to serve 16 hours of classroom volunteer work in four Orange County elementary schools; the control subjects were each assigned research projects focusing upon in-depth studies of concepts represented in the academic course being taken.

Subject Characteristics

Of the 85 subjects who were selected for the study, 78 remained to finish their courses and projects. Of the original 43 experimental subjects, 3 dropped the courses they were taking, leaving 40 experimental subjects to complete the study. Forty-two control subjects began the study, and 4 dropped their courses, leaving 38 in the final control group.

The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 45. The experimental group contained 30 females and 10 males; the control group contained 27 females and 11 males. Table 1 reports the number of subjects in each treatment group according to their intended teaching level and according to the classes being taken, i.e., either or both Analysis of Teaching and Classroom Management and Learning.

Table 1

Experimental and Control Subjects' Intended Teaching Level and Number of Classes Taken

Treatment Group	Teaching Level	Classes Taken	
		One	Two
	N	N	N
Experimental			
Elementary	18	10	8
Secondary	7	4	3
Undecided	15	13	2
Control			
Elementary	9	7	2
Secondary	12	6	6
Undecided	17	16	1

While 27 subjects declared an intention to teach on the elementary level and 19 on the secondary level, the undecided group included subjects who were majoring in areas leading to a kindergarten through grade 12 certification such as physical education, music, and educational media. The undecided group also included students who were taking an education course to assist them in making decisions about teaching as a career.

Descriptions of the Field Experiences

A public school classroom field experience is a traditional component of both Analysis of Teaching and Classroom Management and Learning. One objective of the experiences is for beginning preservice teachers to observe and practice as many of the concepts and skills represented in the courses as the field experiences permit.

The experimental subjects' 16 hours of field experiences were arranged through Orange County ADDitions, a classroom volunteer organization serving all of Orange County, Florida, schools. Prior to the beginning of the study, arrangements were made with ADDitions to place the experimental subjects in four elementary schools to serve as aides to teachers requesting such help. The subjects were expected to serve for two hours per week for a period of eight weeks.

The four participating elementary schools were Cheney, Bonneville, Brookshire, and Aloma. The ADDitions coordinators serving each school and the teachers requesting UCF students were notified of the study, and their cooperation and assistance were requested. The teachers were encouraged to offer UCF students as wide a variety of experiences as the teachers' objectives and lesson plans would permit.

During the second class session when the subjects received their group placement, the ADDitions director and her assistant presented the experimental subjects with an introduction to the volunteer program. At this time, each experimental subject completed an ADDitions application and requested the school he or she preferred among the four choices. By the third week of the quarter, the students received their school and teacher assignments and were ready to begin their field experiences.

The content of the field experiences was left to the discretion of the participating teachers. The types of activities varied from running off dittoes for the teacher to whole class teaching. The teachers expressed the greatest need for tutors of one to three children in either reading or math. The teachers also requested assistance in grading papers, preparing bulletin boards, and leading small groups of children in various activities.

Methods of Data Collection

Instruments

The 30 item TCCL-B and 20 item PCI were selected for pretesting and posttesting. When the TCCL-B was developed, the Self, Task, and Impact internal reliabilities were established using an adaptation of the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 (George, Borich, & Fuller, 1974). These reliability coefficients were .86 for Self, .79 for Task, and .91 for Impact. In the development of the PCI, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) used a split-half method and reported a Pearson product moment coefficient of .91, corrected to .95 by the Spearman-Brown formula.

In order to test the reliability of the TCCL-B and PCI on the present study's pretest and posttest administrations, each subscale was split by odd and even numbers, and the split halves were correlated. Pearson Correlation was applied and corrected with the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula to estimate reliability. Table 2 reports the internal reliability estimates for pretesting and posttesting.

Table 2

TCCL-B and PCI Pretest and Posttest Internal Reliability Estimates

Subscale	Pretest Reliability Estimate	Posttest Reliability Estimate
Self	.92	.87
Task	.85	.81
Impact	.96	.94
Control	.78	.68

As the table indicates, the internal reliabilities for each subscale were higher for pretesting than for posttesting. The Impact subscale had the highest reliability estimate on both administrations while the Control subscale had the lowest. The pretest Self, Task, and Impact estimates were somewhat higher than the internal reliability estimates provided by George et al., but the posttest estimates were similar. Both pretest and posttest Control reliability estimates were lower than those reported in the development of the PCI.

Pretesting and Posttesting

All subjects were pretested during their classes the 1st week of the study and posttested during their classes the 10th week. The researcher administered the tests and explained the study's purposes and procedures. The students were told the study had as its objective to determine the value to beginning preservice teachers of participating in either an in-school experience or an academic project.

Interviews

In an effort to validate the concerns expressed on the TCCL-B and PCI, the researcher conducted interviews with each of the subjects. The objective was to provide subjects the opportunity to express their concerns about teaching and pupil control within the framework of an open discussion about their field experiences.

The interviews were conducted during the 9th and 10th weeks of the study. Each interview was tape recorded with the permission of the subject, and the Self, Task, Impact, and custodial statements were identified and checked from the tape recording on coding sheets.

The length of each interview was approximately 15 minutes. Five general questions were asked with additional probing questions if the subject or the researcher needed clarification of the question asked or the answer given. The following are the questions asked of each subject:

1. You now have had several weeks of involvement with education through your coursework and your project (either library project or field experience). Let's assume you have been hired to teach at Central (Elementary or Secondary) School, and tomorrow is the first day you will spend with your students. In thinking about teaching these students tomorrow and the rest of the school year, what might you be concerned about today and why?

2. What kind of classroom discipline would you want?
   Probing question: If you were to place yourself on a continuum of almost no discipline being one and very strict discipline being ten, where would you place yourself and why?

3. Did you have any problems of any kind with your project, and, if so, what were they?

4. If UCF could design a course for next quarter to meet your learning needs in your preparation to become a teacher, what would you want to be offered in this course?
   Probing question: What topics about teaching and learning do you want to study further?

5. Beyond what we have already discussed, would you like to add anything about your project which would help me in evaluating the experiences students have had in conjunction with their course or courses this quarter?

In conducting these interviews, the researcher made every effort to put the subjects at ease and not suggest responses to the subjects. Therefore, the researcher's contribution to the interviews consisted of asking questions, occasionally paraphrasing answers for clarification, murmurs of agreement, and extending appreciation for the subjects' cooperation and participation in the study.

Field Experience Logs

In an effort to determine whether the kinds of experiences the experimental subjects had in the schools had a relationship to their posttest scores, details of the subjects' school experiences were needed. In order to collect these data, the experimental subjects were given Field Experience Logs upon which to record the kinds of experiences they had each week and the amount of time spent in each experience per week. The logs were charts designed in a matrix with horizontal columns noting kinds of experiences and vertical columns representing each week. (See Appendix.) The logs were collected the final week of the study.

The kinds of experiences included on the logs ranged from "making dittoes for the teacher," representing no pupil involvement to "teaching the whole class," representing maximum involvement with pupils. The remaining experience categories were "preparing a bulletin board," "grading papers," "planning a lesson with the teacher," "discussion with the teacher," "observation of the class with no participation," "tutoring one child," "tutoring two or three children," "teaching a small group of four to eight children," and "teaching a large group of nine to fifteen children." A request was also made for subjects to note experiences which appeared to be exceptions to the suggested categories. In all, 11 categories of experiences were included which were expected to represent most of the kinds of experiences the experimental subjects would have.

Classroom Observation

In an effort to validate behaviorally the experimental subjects' concerns about teaching and their pupil control orientations, a classroom observation procedure was employed. The project had as its goal the observation of six experimental subjects while they were participating in their field study; by observing these subjects, identification could be made of their Self, Task, Impact, and Control behaviors. The behaviors examined were statements made by the subjects. The objective was to determine if a correlation existed between the concerns expressed by the preservice teachers and their verbal behaviors displayed during their field experiences.

The observation project proceeded through a series of steps. The first step was to develop a method of categorizing and quantifying the statements made by the subjects. After consulting the research leading to the development of teacher concerns (Fuller, 1969; Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1971) and pupil control ideologies (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967) and after consulting teacher education professors and graduate students who had experience teaching beginning preservice teachers, a conceptualization was formed of the kinds of statements expected to be made by the subjects during their field experiences and the likely identification of those statements into Self, Task, Impact, and custodial categories. The decision was then made to check each statement made by the subject during the field experience on a coding sheet according to the statement's appropriate category (see Appendix).

The next step was to train the observers who would collect the observation data. Two former teachers were hired through an advertisement in the Orlando Sentinel-Star (March 30-April 1, 1981), and their training began during the study's third week. The training consisted of five sessions during which the observers categorized written statements, coded tape recordings of a UCF instructor teaching a class, observed and coded a UCF instructor teaching a beginning preservice education class, and observed and coded an experimental subject participating in her field experience. Each coding rehearsal was followed by a conference to clarify misunderstandings and discuss problems.

During the final coding rehearsal when the experimental subject was observed participating in her field experience, inter-rater reliability was established. Inter-rater reliability was considered to be the percentage of statements upon which the two observers agreed, a procedure recommended by Good and Brophy (1978) for two observers. The observers reached 98% agreement on the total number of statements to be coded, and they agreed upon 87.7% of the precise coding of the statements. Therefore, the inter-rater reliability of the two observers was established at 87.7%.

A table of random numbers was used to select the experimental subjects to be observed. The observations began the fifth week of the study with each observer being assigned three experimental subjects to observe for one hour each week. The original goal for the number of hours of observation for each subject was six. However, because of end-of-year elementary school activities during which the experimental subjects simply observed activities and because some experimental subjects finished early their required number of hours of field experience, the observers were unable to meet the six hour goal for each experimental subject. One observer completed 15 hours of observation for her three experimental subjects; the other observer completed 12 hours of observation for her three subjects.

Summary of Data Collection

In summary, data were collected from the entire study sample by means of pre- and posttesting on the TCCL-B and PCI and from interviews with each subject. Data were collected from the experimental group only by means of their Field Experience Logs and from a sample of the experimental subjects through classroom observation. With the exception of the Field Experience Logs, each source of data was quantified and analyzed in terms of the Self, Task, Impact, and Control categories.

Methods of Data Analysis

All data were analyzed with the objective of determining specific effects on the experimental group attributable to the EFE's. All raw data were hand scored and tabulated in preparation for computer analysis. Procedures for determining effects were selected computer subprograms from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975) (SPSS). The analysis of variance subprogram ANOVA was computed on the TCCL-B and PCI pre- and posttest scores and the interviews to determine differences between groups and interactions resulting from the independent variables intended teaching level and number of classes taken. The SPSS subprogram Pearson Correlation was used to determine the split half reliability on the pre- and posttesting of the TCCL-B and PCI. The Partial Correlation subprogram was applied to the experimental group's Field Experience Logs to determine if a relationship existed between the experimental subjects' TCCL-B and PCI posttest scores and their experiences in the schools. The classroom observation data were analyzed using the Spearman Rank Difference Correlation method which correlated observed subscale scores with the sample of subjects' posttest subscale scores. All SPSS programs were conducted at the UCF Computer Center.

The data collected met the assumptions upon which the statistical procedures are based. All scores were interval in nature and came from subjects randomly placed into experimental and control groups. The subjects were considered to be representative of UCF beginning preservice teachers who take introductory education courses during any academic term. Therefore, the subjects were considered to have the same variability as would any other UCF beginning preservice teacher sample. While the unequal distribution within the independent variable groupings posed a problem in interpreting the data, the differences were fully recognized in drawing conclusions.

Summary

This chapter has described the procedures used to conduct the study of the effects of an EFE upon beginning preservice teachers' concerns about teaching and their orientations to pupil control. The descriptions have included details of the population characteristics and group placement, specific details on the arrangement and conduct of the field experiences, details on the methods of data collection, and a summary of the methods of data analyses. Chapter IV will report the results of the data analyses.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter reports effects of an Early Field Experience (EFE) upon the teaching concerns and pupil control orientations of beginning preservice teachers. Results are reported in sections describing the analysis of each set of collected data.

The Study Design

The design of the study followed Campbell and Stanley's (1966) Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design of the form

RO X 0
RO 0.

The subjects were pretested on the Teacher Concerns Check List, Form B (TCCL-B) and Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI) and were randomly placed into experimental and control groups. The treatment given to the experimental group was a 16 hour field experience serving as elementary school volunteers. At the conclusion of the study, both groups were posttested on the TCCL-B and PCI, and the scores were analyzed to determine if differences in the scores could be attributable to the treatment of the field experience.

In order to study more thoroughly the subjects' teaching concerns and pupil control orientations, additional data were collected. At the conclusion of the study, each subject was interviewed regarding his/her teaching and control concerns in order to study the relationship between posttested and verbally expressed concerns. Data were also collected on the experimental subjects' field experiences by analyzing their activities in the schools and the correlation between those activities and the experimental subjects' posttest scores. In addition, a sample of the experimental subjects was observed participating in the field experiences in order to validate behaviorally the subjects' teaching concerns and control orientations.

Data Analysis

On all sets of collected data, analyses were focused upon the subjects' concerns about teaching and their pupil control orientations. The concerns about teaching were described by Fuller (1969) and Fuller, Parsons, and Watkins (1973) as the self concerns of teaching (Self), the tasks of teaching (Task) and the impact of teaching upon pupil learning (Impact). These concerns were pretested and posttested by subscales on the *TCCL-B*. Subjects' pupil control orientations were their degrees of custodialism (Control) as measured by the *PCI* subscale. Data from the interviews, the subjects' field experiences, and the classroom observation of the sample of experimental subjects were all analyzed in relationship to the Self, Task, Impact, and Control concepts and the scores from the subscales.

Pretest and Posttest Analyses

The 30 item *TCCL-B* provided for a minimum score of 10 and a maximum score of 50 on each of the three subscales of Self, Task, and Impact. The 20 item *PCI* provided for a minimum custodial score of 20 and a maximum score of 100. All response sheets were hand scored for both pre- and posttesting.

A three factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze independently the TCCL-B and PCI pretest and posttest scores on each subscale. The dependent variables were the Self, Task, Impact, and Control subscale scores; each dependent variable was analyzed separately. The three independent variables selected for study on each ANOVA were treatment (experimental or control), the subjects' intended teaching levels (elementary, secondary, or undecided), and whether the subjects took one or both of the education courses involved in the study (one or two classes taken).

Pretest and Posttest Self Analysis

The TCCL-B Self subscale contained items demonstrating a concern for the self as teacher. As reported in Table 3, the ANOVA indicated no significant differences were present on pretesting between groups on the independent variables of treatment, intended teaching level, and classes taken, nor were there significant interactions between and among the independent variables. The greatest difference occurred among categories of the independent variable classes taken which had a sum of squares of 101.77, an F ratio of 1.34, and a significance level of .25. Thus, the subjects in all categories of the independent variables had approximately the same variability on the pretest Self subscale.

The ANOVA on the posttest Self scores also indicated no significant differences on the independent variables as reported in Table 3. However, near significance was reached between the experimental and

Table 3

Analysis of Variance Results on Pretest and Posttest Self Subscale

Source of Variation	Pretest					Posttest				
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Treatment	1	70.09	70.09	.92		1	151.80	151.80	3.38	.07
Teaching Level	2	99.68	49.84	.66		2	95.04	47.52	1.06	
Classes Taken	1	101.77	101.77	1.34	.25	1	12.66	12.66	.28	
Treatment X Teaching Level	2	106.16	53.08	.70		2	327.76	163.88	3.65	.03
Treatment X Classes Taken	1	38.27	38.27	.50		1	13.25	13.25	.30	
Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	42.71	21.35	.28		2	85.41	42.71	.95	
Treatment X Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	54.40	27.20	.36		2	59.75	29.88	.44	
Residual	66	5011.80	75.94			66	2962.82	44.89		
Total	77	5604.68	72.79			77	3703.49	48.10		

control groups on the treatment variable which had a sum of squares of 151.80, an F ratio of 3.38, and a significance level of .07. As indicated by the means reported in Table 4, both experimental and control groups had only slight increases in their Self mean scores from pre- to posttesting, but the control group had a greater decrease in their standard deviation. Therefore, the greater F ratio on posttesting can be attributed to a reduction in error variance from pre- to posttesting. This suggested the control group was much more unified in their Self concerns upon posttesting than were subjects in the experimental group.

Table 4

Group Mean Scores on Pretest and Posttest Self Subscale

Independent Variable	N	Pretest Mean	S.D.	Posttest Mean	S.D.
Treatment Group					
Experimental	40	34.93	8.75	35.10	7.77
Control	38	32.21	8.18	32.47	5.73
Teaching Level					
Elementary	27	35.33	8.33	33.82	8.29
Secondary	19	31.95	10.58	35.63	6.90
Undecided	32	33.13	7.28	32.75	5.57
Classes Taken					
One	56	32.86	8.70	33.27	7.21
Two	22	35.50	7.98	35.23	6.12
Group X Teaching Level Interaction					
Experimental					
Elementary	18	35.28		33.28	
Secondary	7	36.00		41.57	
Undecided	15	34.00		34.27	
Control					
Elementary	9	35.44		34.89	
Secondary	12	29.58		32.17	
Undecided	17	32.35		31.41	

A significant difference was reached when treatment interacted with teaching level (p = .031). However, the interaction was disordinate with the experimental elementary group expressing lower concerns than the control elementary group and the experimental secondary and undecided groups expressing higher concerns than the corresponding control secondary and undecided groups. Therefore, as an independent variable, the subjects' teaching levels were influencing their Self concerns, and when analyzed according to the interaction of treatment and teaching level, the differences among the groups on the Self posttest scores resulted in an F ratio of 3.65. However, the meaningfulness of the differences is reduced when the pretest score means on the interaction are observed. As is indicated in Table 4, the score distribution pattern among the teaching level groups was the same on pretesting as on posttesting. The effect of the treatment seemed to magnify already existing differences.

Pretest and Posttest Task Analysis

Items on the Task subscale reflected concerns for the tasks of teaching. Both pretest and posttest ANOVA results indicated no statistically significant F tests on either the independent variables or the interactions among variables. Table 5 reports the pretest ANOVA results. As is indicated, the largest pretest variability occurred on the interaction of treatment by classes taken which had a sum of squares of 134.82, an F ratio of 2.28, and a significance level of .136.

The posttest ANOVA resulted in no significant F tests on the independent variables, but significance was nearly reached on the

Table 5

Analysis of Variance Results on Pretest and Posttest Task Subscale

Source of Variation	Pretest					Posttest				
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Treatment	1	30.31	30.31	.51		1	9.47	9.47	.23	
Teaching Level	2	39.75	19.88	.34		2	112.46	56.23	1.37	
Classes Taken	1	4.17	4.17	.07		1	54.08	54.08	1.32	
Treatment X Teaching Level	2	125.79	62.90	1.06		2	246.05	123.02	3.01	.056
Treatment X Classes Taken	1	134.82	134.82	2.28	.136	1	111.58	111.58	2.73	
Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	28.48	14.24	.24		2	88.06	44.03	1.08	
Treatment X Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	11.95	5.98	.10		2	43.71	21.85	.44	
Residual	66	3902.11	59.12			66	2701.23	40.93		
Total	77	4235.29	55.00			77	3292.99	42.77		

interaction of treatment by teaching level (p = .056). The interaction had a sum of squares of 246.05 and an F ratio of 3.01. The other interactions did not result in statistically significant differences.

The group means reported in Table 6 suggest that when pretest Task means are compared to posttest Task means on the interaction of treatment by teaching level, the experimental elementary group was affected differently from the other teaching level groups. The experimental elementary group both decreased its Task concerns from pretesting and expressed the fewest posttest Task concerns of all the teaching level groups. In addition, the experimental secondary group expressed the highest number of posttest Task concerns and had the largest pre- to posttest increases. Therefore, while the experimental elementary group was decreasing its Task concerns during the study, all other groups were increasing their Task concerns with the greatest increase expressed by the experimental secondary group.

Table 6

Pretest and Posttest Group Means for the Treatment by Teaching Level Interaction on the Task Subscale

Group	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
Experimental			
Elementary	18	28.56	26.83
Secondary	7	28.00	33.86
Undecided	16	28.93	30.27
Control			
Elementary	9	30.00	31.11
Secondary	12	26.50	29.33
Undecided	17	25.59	28.29

Pretest and Posttest Impact Analyses

Items on the Impact subscale contained concerns with the impact of teaching upon pupil learning. The ANOVA on the pretest Impact subscale indicated no significant differences existed within any independent variable or on any interaction. As reported in Table 7, the largest variability occurred on the interaction treatment by classes taken with a sum of squares of 120.58, an F ratio of 1.39, and a significance level of .243.

The ANOVA on the posttest Impact subscale resulted in no significant differences between groups on the independent variables, but, as reported in Table 7, the interaction of teaching level and classes taken was significant ($p = .003$). In addition, the treatment by teaching level interaction approached significance ($p = .077$).

Table 8 reports the mean scores for the groups in the interaction teaching level by classes taken. As is indicated by the numbers of persons represented in the cells, the significant interaction appeared to be a phenomenon of unequal cell sizes. Only three people from the undecided teaching level group took two classes, and their posttest mean score was 28.00, compared to a mean between 39.12 to 43.44 for the other five groups in the interaction. Therefore, while the interaction was significant, it was most likely an artifact of the small cell size of the undecided teaching level group taking two classes.

The Impact means for all groups in the teaching level by treatment interaction increased from pre- to posttesting with the exception of the experimental elementary teaching level group. The means for the treatment by teaching level interaction indicate a pattern similar to the posttest Self and Task subscales. The experimental elementary

Table 7

Analysis of Variance Results on Pretest and Posttest Impact Subscale

Source of Variation	Pretest					Posttest				
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Treatment	1	26.24	26.24	.30		1	16.60	16.60	.37	
Teaching Level	2	165.26	82.63	.95		2	54.47	27.24	.61	
Classes Taken	1	41.45	41.45	.48		1	4.91	4.91	.11	
Treatment X Teaching Level	2	61.56	30.78	.36		2	236.81	118.40	2.66	.077
Treatment X Classes Taken	1	120.58	120.58	1.39	.243	1	29.84	29.84	.67	
Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	79.09	39.55	.46		2	551.60	275.80	6.20	.003
Treatment X Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	90.94	45.47	.52		2	135.25	67.62	1.52	
Residual	66	571.37	66.72			66	2934.71	44.46		
Total	77	6295.04	81.75			77	3925.18	50.98		

Table 8

Pretest and Posttest Group Impact Means for the Interactions Teaching Level by Classes Taken and Treatment by Teaching Level

Group	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
Teaching Level X Classes Taken			
Elementary			
One Class	17	41.82	39.12
Two Classes	10	38.30	41.20
Secondary			
One Class	10	37.40	40.70
Two Classes	9	36.67	43.44
Undecided			
One Class	29	37.34	41.21
Two Classes	3	38.67	28.00
Treatment X Teaching Level			
Experimental			
Elementary	18	39.89	38.44
Secondary	7	39.43	44.57
Undecided	15	38.40	39.27
Control			
Elementary	9	41.78	42.78
Secondary	12	35.67	40.50
Undecided	17	36.65	40.59

group had the lowest posttest Impact mean (38.44) of all teaching level groups and decreased the expression of Impact concerns from pretesting. The other five teaching level groups had higher posttest Impact means and increased the expression of concerns from pretesting. Among the teaching level groups, the experimental secondary group had the highest posttest Impact mean (44.57) and the highest pre- to posttest score increases. Thus, while the interaction was not statistically significant, the score distribution pattern was similar to the Self and Task posttest scores with the experimental elementary group because of its score decreases being affected differently from the other teaching level groups.

Pretest and Posttest Control Analyses

Items on the Control subscale contained custodial orientations to pupil control. The ANOVA on the pretest Control scores resulted in no significant F tests. As is indicated in Table 9, the independent variable classes taken had the largest variability with a sum of squares 56.29, an F test of 1.36, and a significance level of .248.

The posttest ANOVA resulted in no statistically significant differences within the independent variables, but when treatment was considered with teaching level, a significant interaction resulted ($p = .033$). Table 9 reports the results of the ANOVA on the posttest control subscale scores. As is indicated, the interaction had a sum of squares 337.31 and an F ratio of 3.59.

The effect of teaching level on subjects' expressions of custodialism is evident in the group means of the interaction treatment by teaching level reported in Table 10. The pattern of scores on the

Table 9

Analysis of Variance Results on Pretest and Posttest Control Subscale

Source of Variation	Pretest					Posttest				
	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Treatment	1	6.44	6.44	.16		1	5.76	5.76	.12	
Teaching Level	2	3.22	1.61	.04		2	50.55	25.27	.54	
Classes Taken	1	56.29	56.29	1.36	.248	1	9.55	9.55	.20	
Treatment X Teaching Level	2	94.98	47.49	1.15		2	337.31	168.65	3.59	.03
Treatment X Classes Taken	1	19.50	19.50	.47		1	.18	.18	.00	
Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	55.63	27.82	.67		2	16.84	8.42	.18	
Treatment X Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	44.07	22.03	.53		2	146.84	73.42	1.56	
Residual	66	2733.57	41.42			66	3101.18	46.99		
Total	77	3401.96	39.51			77	3673.29	47.70		

posttest was similar to that on the pretest, but the differences between both elementary and secondary groups increased during the study. As is indicated, the greatest posttest difference was between the experimental and control elementary groups with the experimental elementary group having the lower posttest mean (49.17), a decrease in custodialism from the pretest. The control elementary group had the highest expression of custodialism (55.22) among all posttest scores, an increase from pretesting. The secondary level groups reversed the pattern with the experimental secondary group having a higher mean (53.43), an increase from pretesting, and the control secondary group having the lowest posttest mean of all groups (49.08), a decrease from pretesting. Both undecided groups had similar posttest means and similar decreases from pretesting. Therefore, teaching level remained influential on control orientations throughout the study, but the different pre- to posttest score changes indicate other influences were intervening.

Table 10

Pretest and Posttest Group Control Means for the Interaction Treatment by Teaching Level

Group	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
Experimental			
Elementary	18	51.06	49.17
Secondary	7	53.29	53.43
Undecided	15	51.80	49.67
Control			
Elementary	9	54.67	55.22
Secondary	12	51.67	49.08
Undecided	17	50.94	48.65

Interviews Analyses

The teaching and custodial concerns expressed by each subject during the interviews were coded into Self, Task, Impact, and Control score categories. Each time the subject expressed a different concern, that concern received a point in one of the categories. This provided a single score for each subject on each category. The interview category scores were first correlated with the subscale scores on the TCCL-B and PCI to determine the relationship between tested and verbally expressed concerns. The Pearson correlations indicated low relationships across all subscales. The Pearson coefficients were .18 for Self, -.14 for Task, .11 for Impact, and .33 for Control.

Because the relationships were low, the interview data were assumed to be measuring a different construct. An ANOVA was applied to each category of the interview scores to explore the effects of treatment on group means. The interview data were cautiously interpreted, however, because of the possibility of interviewer bias since the researcher both conducted and coded the interviews.

Interview Self Subscale

As indicated by the ANOVA results reported in Table 11, significant differences resulted between treatment groups. The sum of squares (220.38) produced an F ratio of 13.21 and a significance level of .001. The group means reported in Table 12 indicate the experimental group expressed a mean of 10.80 Self concerns compared to the control group mean of 7.24. Therefore, during the interviews, a statistically different expression of Self concerns was occurring between the experimental and control groups.

Table 11

Analysis of Variance Results on Interview Self Subscale Scores

Variable Group	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Treatment	1	220.38	220.38	13.21	.001
Teaching Level	2	85.92	42.96	2.58	.084
Classes Taken	1	1.08	1.08	.07	
Treatment X Teaching Level	2	9.36	4.68	.28	
Treatment X Classes Taken	1	50.99	50.99	3.03	.086
Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	9.53	4.76	.29	
Treatment X Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	5.60	2.80	.17	
Residual	66	1100.96	16.68		
Total	77	1498.68	19.46		

Table 12

Interview Subscale Means

Variable Groups	N	Self Mean	S.D.	Task Mean	S.D.	Impact Mean	S.D.	Control Mean	S.D.
Treatment									
Experimental	40	10.80	4.81	4.06	3.23	3.23	2.85	2.03	2.02
Control	38	7.24	3.07	1.34	1.68	1.24	1.92	2.37	1.99
Teaching Level									
Elementary	27	10.37	4.37	3.19	3.52	2.56	2.76	2.48	2.01
Secondary	19	9.63	4.40	2.32	2.69	2.11	2.77	2.00	1.73
Undecided	32	7.63	4.16	2.63	2.51	2.09	2.48	2.06	2.17
Classes Taken									
One	56	8.79	4.78	2.68	2.74	2.50	2.85	2.05	1.91
Two	22	9.77	3.28	2.91	3.93	1.64	1.84	2.54	2.22

The independent variable teaching level approached significance (p = 0.84) with the elementary group expressing a higher number of mean Self concerns (10.37) than the secondary group (9.63) and the undecided group (7.63). The interaction of treatment by classes taken also approached significance (p = .086). Students in the experimental group who took one class had a higher Self mean (11.07) than control students taking one class (6.66). Furthermore, these differed more widely than both treatment groups taking two classes. The experimental group taking two classes had fewer Self concerns ($\overline{X} = 10.23$) than the one class experimental group, but the two class control group had a larger number of Self concerns ($\overline{X} = 9.11$) than the one class control group. The unequal cell sizes probably contributed to this disordinate interaction.

Interview Task Subscale

Table 13 reports the ANOVA results for the interview Task subscale. The F ratio of 19.28 for treatment was statistically significant (p = .001), but no other independent variable or interaction was significant.

As indicated by the means reported in Table 12, all subjects expressed a low number of Task concerns during the interviews. The experimental group, however, expressed more numerous Task concerns than did the control group. The significant difference between the treatment groups was probably the result of the low number of Task concerns expressed by a majority of the subjects. The few experimental subjects who expressed larger numbers of Task concerns had the effect of positively skewing the group's distribution. A similar distribution

Table 13

Analysis of Variance Results on Interview Task Subscale Scores

Variable Group	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Treatment	1	135.60	135.60	19.28	.001
Teaching Level	2	.03	.01	.00	
Classes Taken	1	.07	.07	.01	
Treatment X Teaching Level	2	15.31	7.66	1.09	
Treatment X Classes Taken	1	4.61	4.61	.66	
Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	19.93	9.97	1.42	
Treatment X Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	15.07	7.53	1.07	
Residual	66	464.13	7.03		
Total	77	656.87	8.53		

pattern was evident with the control group as well, but the variability was less.

Interview Impact Subscale

The ANOVA on the interview Impact scores resulted in a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups. As reported in Table 14, the F ratio of 13.76 was significant at less than .001. As indicated by the group means reported in Table 12, all subjects expressed a low number of Impact concerns, but the mean for the experimental group (3.23) was higher than the mean for the control group (1.24). The significant difference perhaps was the result of a few subjects in the experimental group expressing larger numbers of Impact concerns which had the effect of positively skewing the experimental group distribution and, thus, raising the mean.

A statistically significant difference occurred between groups on the independent variable classes taken. Subjects who took one class expressed a higher number of Impact concerns ($\overline{X} = 2.50$) than subjects who took two classes ($\overline{X} = 1.84$). Although not statistically significant, the interaction of treatment by classes taken assisted in clarifying the main effect of classes taken. The interaction was disordinal with a pattern of means similar to that for the interview Self subscale. The difference between the means for the experimental group taking one class ($\overline{X} = 3.93$) and the mean for the control group taking one class ($\overline{X} = 1.17$) was greater than the difference between means of the groups taking two classes. The experimental group taking two classes had a mean of 1.77, which was only slightly different from the

Table 14

Analysis of Variance Results on Interview Impact Subscale Scores

Variable Group	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Treatment	1	81.82	81.82	13.76	.001
Teaching Level	2	5.78	2.89	.48	
Classes Taken	1	23.84	23.84	4.01	.049
Treatment X Teaching Level	2	5.83	2.92	.49	
Treatment X Classes Taken	1	18.76	18.76	3.15	.080
Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	2.78	1.39	.23	
Treatment X Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	8.22	4.11	.69	
Residual	66	392.56	5.95		
Total	77	530.87	6.89		

mean of 1.44 for the control group taking two classes. Therefore, the difference between the treatment groups was affected by the number of classes taken as well as overall differences in treatment.

Interview Control Subscale

Table 15 reports the ANOVA results for the interview Control subscale. As indicated, no significant differences resulted either from the main effects of the independent variables or from any interaction among the variables.

Only custodial concerns were coded from the interviews, and the number of verbalized custodial concerns was low for all subjects. As is indicated in Table 12, the treatment groups expressed similar numbers of custodial statements, and the elementary group expressed more custodial statements than the other two teaching level groups. Furthermore, when teaching level was considered with treatment, the control elementary group expressed the highest number of custodial statements ($\overline{X} = 3.44$).

Distribution of Interview Scores

With some variation all the interview subscales had positively skewed distributions which perhaps affected the correlation with the *TCCL-B* and *PCI*. The control group's skewed distribution particularly affected the overall distribution because more control subjects expressed fewer concern statements on all the subscales. Also, the experimental groups had positively skewed distributions which were the result of a few subjects' higher concerns scores.

Table 15

Analysis of Variance Results on Interview Control Subscale Scores

Variable Group	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	p
Treatment	1	4.88	4.88	1.26	
Teaching Level	2	5.18	2.59	.67	
Classes Taken	1	4.42	4.42	1.14	
Treatment X Teaching Level	2	11.22	5.61	1.45	
Treatment X Classes Taken	1	1.34	1.34	.35	
Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	11.46	5.73	1.48	
Treatment X Teaching Level X Classes Taken	2	18.89	9.44	2.44	
Residual	66	255.63	3.87		
Total	77	308.12	4.00		

Field Experience Activity Logs

To explore the types of experiences the experimental group had in the schools and the nature of the relationship between the types of field experiences and the TCCL-B and PCI posttest scores, the field experience activity logs (Logs) were assigned scores which were analyzed by Partial Correlation. Log scores were derived by assigning weights to each category of experiences subjects had in the schools and then multiplying the weight by the number of hours a subject participated in that category of experience. A subject's individual Log score was then obtained by summing the resulting score for each category. The resulting score was considered to reflect the quality of the field experience with the term quality defined by category of experience and amount of time spent in the experience.

To determine the weights for each experience category, a list of the types of experiences obtained by the experimental subjects was given to five UCF faculty members with experience in teaching beginning preservice teachers. The faculty members were asked to assign a number from 1 to 10 to each category with the assigned number reflecting the faculty member's perception of the value of that category of in-school experience for a beginning preservice teacher. The weights for each category were the mean weights of the faculty members' assigned scores. Table 16 reports the categories of experiences and the weights assigned to each category. Category Five, Discussion with the teacher, was combined with Category Four, Planning a lesson with the teacher, since few students responded to Category Four.

Table 16

Mean Weights Assigned to Categories of Experiences

Category	Mean Weight
1. Making dittoes for the teacher.	1.1
2. Preparing a bulletin board.	1.6
3. Grading papers.	2.5
4 & 5. Discussion with the teacher.	3.2
6. Observation of the class (No participation).	4.1
7. Tutoring 1 child.	3.8
8. Tutoring 2 or 3 children.	4.6
9. Teaching a small group (4 to 8 children).	5.6
10. Teaching a large group (9 to 15 children).	6.4
11. Teaching the whole class.	8.2

The Log scores for the 40 experimental subjects ranged from a low of 40 to a high of 139, with a mean of 67.95 and a standard deviation of 24.63. This distribution is positively skewed and is affected by five Logs with scores above 100. These five scores reflected subjects who had spent more than 20 hours in their field experiences.

The Partial Correlation, controlling for pretest scores, revealed almost no relationship between TCCL-B and PCI subscale scores and Log scores. As indicated in Table 17, the Self subscale was the only correlation approaching significance, and the relationship with the Log score was negative. This suggests that the more experiences a subject had and the more time spent in those experiences, the fewer Self concerns were expressed.

Table 17

Partial Correlation of Logs with Posttest Subscale Scores

	Postself	Posttask	Postimpact	Postcontrol
Log	-.24 p = .067	-.01	-.06	.13

Classroom Observations

During the observation of a sample of the experimental subjects' field experiences, the subjects' statements were coded into Self, Task, Impact, and Custodial categories, and the codings produced a subscale score for each subject. To analyze the relationship between the sample of six subjects' observed concern and control statements and their corresponding TCCL-B and PCI posttest subscale scores, the Spearman Rank Difference method was used in which the subjects were ranked on both the verbal codings and the posttest subscale scores. The rankings were then correlated to determine the relationship between the subjects' observed and posttested subscale scores. Because not all subjects were observed an equal number of times, the last four observations of each subject were selected for correlation. Table 18 reports the actual scores for each subject on each observed and posttested subscale. Table 19 reports each subject's ranking on each observed and posttested subscale and the correlation coefficient between the observed concerns scores and the posttested subscale scores.

The Self, Task, and Control correlations indicated a moderate relationship between observed and tested concerns. The highest correlation was on the Task subscale, .81. The Impact correlation, .36, was

Table 18

Subjects' Observed and Posttested Scores for Each Subscale

Student	S-1	S-2	T-1	T-2	I-1	I-2	C-1	C-2
A	5	39	72	38	850	41	57	49
B	0	20	48	20	761	35	46	47
C	3	31	10	20	680	22	11	42
D	1	25	22	24	780	36	20	42
E	0	13	21	10	820	26	16	43
F	1	42	51	29	612	36	21	54

Code: S-1 = Self Scale Observed Score
S-2 = Self Scale Posttest Score
T-1 = Task Scale Observed Score
T-2 = Task Scale Posttest Score
I-1 = Impact Scale Observed Score
I-2 = Impact Scale Posttest Score
C-1 = Control Scale Observed Score
C-2 = Control Scale Posttest Score

Table 19

Subjects' Observed and Posttest Rankings and Correlations for Each Subscale

Student	S-1	S-2	T-1	T-2	I-1	I-2	C-1	C-2
A	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2
B	5.5	5	3	4.5	4	4	2	3
C	2	3	6	4.5	5	6	6	5.5
D	3.5	4	4	3	3	2.5	4	5.5
E	5.5	6	5	6	2	5	5	4
F	3.5	1	2	2	6	2.5	3	1
	r = .74		r = .81		r = .36		r = .73	

Code: S-1 = Self Scale Observed Score
S-2 = Self Scale Posttest Score
T-1 = Task Scale Observed Score
T-2 = Task Scale Posttest Score
I-1 = Impact Scale Observed Score
I-2 = Impact Scale Posttest Score
C-1 = Control Scale Observed Score
C-2 = Control Scale Posttest Score

low and indicated little relationship between the observed and expressed Impact concerns.

Summary of Data Analyses

The three-way analysis of variance of the pretest and posttest TCCL-B and PCI indicated no significant differences between and among groups on the Self, Task, Impact, and Control subscales resulting from the independent variables of treatment (field experience or no field experience), the subject's intended teaching level (elementary, secondary, undecided), and number of education classes taken (one or two). However, when the treatment of the field experience was analyzed with the independent variable of the subject's intended teaching level, a significant interaction resulted on the Self and Control subscales, and near significance was reached on the Task and Impact subscales. The consistency of the significant and nearly significant interaction indicated teaching level may have influenced subjects' reactions to the field experience.

The analysis of data from the interviews indicated significant differences between the experimental and control groups on treatment on the Self, Task, and Impact subscales but no differences on the Control subscale. Also, significant differences resulted on the Impact subscale on the independent variable classes taken. However, because the interview subscales had low correlations with the posttest TCCL-B and PCI scores, the two sets of measurements were considered to be examining different domains.

The analysis of the Logs indicated a low and not significant correlation between posttest scores and quality of the field experience. This indicated that neither the amount of time nor the types of activities constituting the field experience influenced differences in posttest scores.

The correlation of the rankings of the classroom observation subscale scores and the sample of experimental subjects' posttest scores was moderate on the Self, Task, and Control subscales but low for the Impact subscale. This indicated satisfactory validation of the verbal behaviors related to concerns for Self, Task, and Control but suggested the difficulty in interpreting verbal behaviors reflecting Impact concerns.

This chapter has reported the results of the study of beginning preservice teachers' concerns about teaching and pupil control orientations. Chapter V will summarize the study, present conclusions, and make recommendations regarding further research.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

Summary of Research Procedures

The purpose of this study was to determine if changes in beginning preservice teachers' concerns about teaching and pupil control orientations are related to an in-school Early Field Experience (EFE). The research procedure was to compare the teaching concerns and control orientations of subjects randomly placed into an experimental group which had been assigned a 16 hour field experience with the teaching concerns and control orientations of subjects randomly placed into a control group which had no field experience. The subjects were 78 beginning preservice teachers enrolled in seven class sections of two introductory education courses.

Data were gathered from pre- and posttesting all subjects on the Teacher Concerns Check List, Form B (TCCL-B) and the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI). The TCCL-B provided three subscale scores reflecting concerns with the Self as teacher, the Tasks of teaching, and the Impact of teaching upon pupil learning. The PCI yielded a single subscale score reflecting the extent of the respondent's custodialism as a control orientation.

Additional data were collected through individual interviews designed to allow each subject the free expression of concerns related to teaching and pupil control. Data collected from the experimental group, alone, included a content analysis of the logs of the subjects' field experience activities (Logs) and classroom observation records of a sample of the experimental group.

Summary of Data Analyses

A three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted independently on each subscale of the pretest and posttest TCCL-B and PCI. The independent variables were treatment (the field experience), the subjects' intended teaching levels (elementary, secondary, or undecided), and number of introductory education classes being taken (one or two). The scores from the Self, Task, Impact, and Control subscales were the dependent variables.

The pretest ANOVA indicated no significant differences between and among groups on any subscale independent variable or interaction among the variables. The posttest ANOVA on each of the Self, Task, Impact, and Control subscale scores also indicated no significant differences between and among groups on the independent variables. However, a significant difference was approached on the Self subscale between groups on the treatment variable.

On the Self and Control subscales, significant differences occurred among groups on the interaction of treatment by teaching level; on the Task and Impact subscales, the interaction nearly reached significance. This result suggests that when treatment and teaching level were considered together, teaching level emerged as an influence upon the way experimental subjects reacted to the field experience. Furthermore, when the groups' pretest mean scores and their distributions were compared to posttest mean scores and their distributions, the experimental elementary teaching level group consistently had decreases in posttest mean scores; the experimental secondary group consistently had increases. No such consistent direction of pre- to posttest score changes were observed for any other teaching level group on all four subscales. On the Self and Control subscales, the groups' pretest mean score distributions were the same as on the posttest, but the posttest differences between corresponding teaching level groups were greater than on pretesting. Thus, the treatment served to magnify differences already existing between teaching level groups.

An ANOVA was performed on the interview subscale scores because the scores did not correlate satisfactorily with the TCCL-B and PCI posttest scores. The ANOVA on the Self, Task, and Impact interview subscales indicated significant differences between the experimental and control groups on the treatment variable. Therefore, on verbal expression of concerns, the field experience made a significant difference. On the Impact subscale, significant differences were reached on the variable classes taken, indicating taking one class aroused more concerns than taking two classes. The influence of number of classes taken was also suggested on the Impact and Self subscales on the nearly significant interaction of treatment by classes taken. The Control subscale ANOVA resulted in no significant differences on independent variables or on interactions among variables.

Interpretation of the interview data was tentative because the researcher was also the interviewer and the data coder. However, interview conditions were different from posttesting conditions in that the interviews allowed for free and open expressions of teaching concerns whereas the posttesting suggested concerns the subjects might have. Also, coding of the Self, Task, Impact, and Control interview concerns was quantitative; this reflected numbers of concerns rather than degree of concern as was the measurement on the TCCL-B and PCI. Therefore, as was suggested by the low correlations between the posttest and interview scores, the two procedures appear to be measuring different constructs.

The experimental group's Logs of the field experiences had extremely low correlations with the posttest subscale scores. Apparently, when the experimental group was analyzed as a whole, the types of activities in which the subjects participated and the amount of time spent in those activities had little to do with subjects' expressions of concerns.

The classroom observation data indicated a moderate relationship between the experimental subjects' posttested and observed concerns and control orientations on the Self, Task, and Control subscales but a low relationship on the Impact subscale. For the sample of experimental subjects observed, interpretation of verbal statements related to Impact content was not consistent with the subjects' stated Impact rankings.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are made in response to the questions upon which the study was based.

1. Will beginning preservice teachers express different concerns about teaching after having a classroom field experience than do beginning preservice teachers who have not had a classroom field experience? Specifically,
    A. Will there be differences in concerns with themselves as teachers?

The results of the pre- and posttesting on the TCCL-B indicated no significant differences in Self concerns between the experimental and control groups which could be related to the field experience. The analysis of the interview data, in contrast, suggested significant differences in verbal expressions of Self concerns between the experimental and control groups. However, since the interviews may have been measuring a different domain from the TCCL-B and because the interview codings were subject to the researcher's bias, the interviews as measurement devices cannot be considered equal to the TCCL-B. Therefore, the conclusion is that the field experience did not result in significantly different expressions of Self concerns attributable only to the field experience.

When the subjects' intended teaching levels were considered with treatment, the interaction between the variables was significant. Therefore, the conclusion is that while the field experience, alone, was not related to significant differences in Self concerns, the field experience combined with the subjects' intended teaching levels did result in differences in Self concerns.

B. Will there be differences in concerns about the tasks of teaching?

The TCCL-B results indicated no significant differences in Task concerns which could be related to the field experience. Even though the interviews suggested differences between treatment groups, the conclusion is that the field experience, alone, did not result in real differences in concerns with the tasks of teaching.

C. Will there be differences in concerns about the impact of teaching upon pupil learning?

The TCCL-B posttest results indicated no significant differences in concerns with the impact of teaching upon pupil learning. The interviews analysis suggested significant differences did exist. However, because the posttests and interviews seemed to be measuring different constructs, the conclusion is that differences in concerns with the impact of teaching upon pupil learning were not related to the field experience.

2. Will beginning preservice teachers express different orientations to pupil control after having a classroom field experience than do beginning preservice teachers with no classroom field experience?

The PCI posttest results and the interviews analysis indicated no significant differences between groups which could be related to the field experience. However, the posttest interaction of treatment by teaching level was significant. Therefore, the conclusion is when the field experience was considered with teaching level, the result was a difference in pupil control orientation which was affected by the subjects' intended teaching levels.

A further conclusion is this study's experimental group's concerns and control orientations were not significantly related to the varied types of experiences had in the schools nor to the amount of time spent in those experiences. Subjects with the fewest experiences and time had approximately the same concerns as those with the most experiences and time spent in the schools. This finding seems to run counter to Fuller's (1969, 1971) suggestion that differing kinds of experiences are effective in arousing teaching concerns. The nearly significant negative correlation between Self concerns and Log scores suggests that perhaps concerns were being resolved. Nonetheless, the conclusion is that the posttested concerns and control orientations and the quality of the field experiences were not significantly related.

An additional conclusion is that the observed experimental sample of subjects' concerns were moderately validated on the Self, Task, and Control subscales but not on the Impact subscale. Therefore, statements made during a teaching situation did not reflect the same Impact concerns represented on the TCCL-B. Perhaps the low Impact correlation between the rankings of the subjects on the posttested and observed measures can be related to the nature of interpreting Impact statements made in a teaching situation. In analyzing the statements made by the sample of experimental subjects while participating in their field experiences, the observers agreed that most of the statements made were those which reflected a concern for pupils' learning as opposed to a Self, Task, or Control concern. While a concern for a pupil's understanding of lesson material was undoubtedly paramount at the moment of a subject's field experience activity, that concern was not necessarily elicited by the Impact posttesting. Therefore, the Self, Task, and Control correlations can be said to have moderately validated the verbal expression of the respective concerns.

The final conclusion of this study is that the field experience was not a sufficiently strong treatment to result in substantial differences in concerns about teaching or pupil control orientations. The subjects were beginning preservice teachers with virtually no experience in the schools in the role of teacher. While the interviews suggested the experimental group had awareness created as a result of the field experiences, these awarenesses were not elicited by the TCCL-B and PCI. The instruments did not appear to be sensitive to whatever concerns the field experiences created in the subjects. If the field experience did arouse concerns in the experimental group, these concerns perhaps did not have sufficient time during the recommended 16 hours of fieldwork to be internalized as concerns strong enough to seek resolution. More likely, the concerns were actualized more as questions than as true concerns. Therefore, the field experience as a treatment variable did not contain sufficient strength to arouse statistically significant differences in teaching concerns or in pupil control orientations.

Recommendations for Further Research

The effect of this study has been to contribute additional data to the body of knowledge regarding the value of first field experiences to beginning preservice teachers. Even though the study could not conclude that an EFE, alone, resulted in differences in concerns about teaching and pupil control orientations, the study has provided insights leading to questions deserving additional research.

The conclusion that a 16 hour field experience was of insufficient strength to effect real differences between groups suggests the need for field experiences which are both longer and more structured. Perhaps if the field experiences in this study had been longer, the nearly significant treatment differences on the Self subscale would have reached significance. Perhaps also differences would have resulted if the field experiences had been more structured. The subjects' school experiences were left to the discretion of the cooperating teachers who primarily needed the subjects to serve as tutors or clerical helpers. The result was the subjects were given little structured assistance or supervision which provided them with feedback regarding their roles. Also, the Log scores displayed considerable variability which indicated little consistency in the duration and content of the experiences. Comments from the subjects indicated more direction and structure would have been helpful.

The finding that an intended teaching level when combined with treatment is influential suggests the need to explore further the influence of intended teaching levels upon subjects' perceptions of teaching and learning. Because the experimental elementary and secondary groups reacted differently in concerns and control arousals, this suggests the need to investigate the appropriateness of field experiences at teaching levels different from the ones on which the subjects eventually plan to teach.

Studies are recommended which further explore the development of teaching concerns in beginning preservice teachers. Such studies would include an examination of teaching concerns of subjects prior to having a field experience in order to direct the planning of appropriate experiences. The interviews conducted in this study suggested awarenesses of the experimental group were being created which were not precisely measured by the TCCL-B and PCI. Classroom observation studies could perhaps more thoroughly describe the processes involved in arousing beginning preservice teachers' concerns.

This study did not indicate that an EFE has much of an effect upon pupil control orientations which contradicted Ross' (1980) finding that an EFE was instrumental in effecting changes. Further research is needed to clarify the role of EFE's in pupil control orientations and their development.

In summary, studies are recommended which investigate longer field experiences with more carefully structured activities, studies which examine the influence of intended teaching level upon beginning preservice teachers' perceptions of teaching and learning and which investigate the appropriateness of participating in a field experience on a teaching level different from the one upon which a student eventually plans to teach, studies which explore concerns about teaching prior to participation in a field experience, and studies which investigate the role of EFE's in pupil control orientations. Such studies as these would assist in clarifying the value of an EFE for a beginning preservice teacher.

In conclusion, this study indicated that for the population selected, a 16 hour, elementary level Early Field Experience was not a sufficiently strong treatment to effect changes in concerns about teaching and pupil control orientations as measured by the TCCL-B and PCI. Furthermore, the study suggested that a preservice teacher's intended teaching level was an influential factor in developing concerns about teaching and pupil control orientations. The findings of this study are in no way conclusive and are hoped to provide direction for the further studies recommended. What this study has done is suggest that the benefits of an Early Field Experience to a beginning preservice teacher are less precise than what might be expected, probably tentative, and more elusive than the researcher had hoped. In order to gain more knowledge about the benefits of an Early Field Experience to beginning preservice teachers' concerns about teaching and pupil control orientations, more research is needed.

APPENDIX

PERSONAL DATA

NAME ______________________________

ADDRESS ____

PHONE ____________________________

ACADEMIC STATUS (Please check) Freshman ___; Sophomore ___; Junior ___;

Senior ___; Graduate ___. Major ______________________________

Are you currently registered in EDF 3603 ___, Section ___.

EDF 3255 ___, Section ___.

Reason for taking this or these courses ____________________________

Level of school on which you hope to teach following graduation:

(Please check) Elementary ___; Secondary ___; Undecided ___;

Neither ___.

If you checked Neither, please explain ________________________

Have you ever been employed as a full-time teacher? Yes ___; No ___.
If yes, When ____

Where ____

Subjects taught ______________________________________

For how long (State in weeks) __________________________

Have you ever been employed as a substitute teacher? Yes ___; No ___.
If yes, When ____

Where ____

For how long (State in days) ___________________________

Have you ever been employed as a Teacher's Aide? Yes ___; No ___.
If yes, When ____

Where ____

For how long (State in weeks) __________________________

Have you ever served as a classroom volunteer? Yes ___; No ___.
If yes, When ______________________________

Where ______________________________

For how long (State in estimated hours) ______________

Have you ever served in any other capacity as a classroom teacher?

Please explain.

Do you have children of your own? Yes ___; No ___.

Are you (Please check) Under 22 ___; 23-25 ___; 26-30 ___; 31-40 ___;

Over 40 ___.

NAME ______________________

FIELD EXPERIENCE LOG

Activity	Week 1 & Time	Week 2 & Time	Week 3 & Time	Week 4 & Time	Week 5 & Time	Week 6 & Time	Week 7 & Time	Week 8 & Time
1. Making dittos for the teacher								
2. Preparing a bulletin board								
3. Grading papers								
4. Planning a lesson with the teacher								
5. Discussion with the teacher								
6. Observation of class (No participation)								
7. Tutoring 1 child								
8. Tutoring 2 or 3 children								
9. Teaching a small group (4-8)								
10. Teaching a large group (9-15)								
11. Teaching the whole class								

Other Activities
(Please explain)

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION CODING SHEET

S ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
T ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
I ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
H ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
C ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
U ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

S ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
T ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
I ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
H ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
C ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
U ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

S ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
T ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
I ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
H ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
C ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
U ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

S ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
T ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
I ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
H ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
C ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
U ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

LIST OF REFERENCES

Abbott, M. G. Intervening variables in organizational behaviors. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1965, *1*, 1-13.

Bartos, R. B. *A study of field participation and classroom experiences and their effects upon the perceptions of prospective teachers*. Bethesda, Maryland: West Virginia University, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 075 381)

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Clarke, A. *The effect of a public school field experience upon student achievement, educational philosophy, and attitudes in an introductory education course*. Grand Forks, North Dakota: University of North Dakota, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 098 171)

Copeland, W. Processes mediating the relationship between cooperating teacher behavior and student teacher classroom performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1978, *70*, 95-100.

Copeland, W. Student teachers and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. *Theory into Practice*, 1980, *18*, 194-199.

Crocker, C. S. Effects of preservice experience on attitudes, self-concept, and teaching effectiveness in a secondary teacher education program (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1980, *41*, 2560-A. (University Microfilms No. 80-27,664)

Day, H. P. Attitude changes of beginning teachers after initial teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1959, *10*, 326-328.

Doyle, W. Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1977, *28*(6), 51-55.

Foley, M. J. The effectiveness of the beginning student teachers at the University of Northern Colorado and the relationship of this effectiveness to Early Field Experience (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1978). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1978, *38*, 4746A-4747A. (University Microfilms No. 77-30,819)

Folkert, L. A. A study of the relationship between early field experiences and student teaching performance at the secondary level (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 236-A. (University Microfilms No. 78-10,047)

Fuller, F. F. Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Fuller, F. F. Relevance for teacher education: A teacher concerns model. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1971.

Fuller, F. F., & Bown, O. H. Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher education. The 74th National Society for the Study of Education yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Fuller, F. F., Bown, O. H., & Peck, R. F. Creating climates for growth. Austin: The University of Texas, 1967.

Fuller, F. F., & Case, C. A manual for scoring the Teacher Concerns Statement. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1971.

Fuller, F. F., & Parsons, J. S. Current research on the concerns of teachers. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 257)

Fuller, F. F., Parsons, J. S., & Watkins, J. E. Concerns of teachers: Research and reconceptualization. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1973.

Gantt, W. M., & Davey, B. Pre-student teachers react to field supplemented methods courses. College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 084 241)

George, A. A. Measuring Self, Task, and Impact concerns: A manual for use of the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire. Austin: The University of Texas, 1978.

George, A. A., Borich, G. D., & Fuller, F. F. Progress report on the Teacher Concerns Checklist. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1974.

Gilbert, D. D., & Levinson, D. J. Custodialism and humanism in mental hospital structure and in staff ideology. In Greenblatt, Milton, and Others (Eds.), The patient and the mental hospital. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

Giroux, H. A. Teacher education and the ideology of social control. Journal of Education, 1980, 162, 5-27.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. Looking in classrooms (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Greene, G. A comparison of attitudes, values, and dogmatism of college juniors and seniors. Journal of Teacher Education, 1972, 23, 343-347.

Harp, M. W. Early field experience--A maturing force. Elementary School Journal, 1974, 74, 369-374.

Hedberg, J. D. The effects of field experience on achievement in educational psychology. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 75-76.

Howey, K., Yarger, S., & Joyce, B. Reflections on preservice preparation. Impressions from the national survey. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29(1), 38-40.

Hoy, W. K. Organizational socialization: The student teacher and Pupil Control Ideology. The Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 61, 153-155.

Hoy, W. K. The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 312-323.

Hoy, W. K. Pupil Control Ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 1969, 77, 257-265.

Hoy, W. K., & Rees, R. The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28(1), 23-26.

Ingle, R. B., & Robinson, E. W. An examination of the value of classroom observation for prospective teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1965, 16, 456-460.

Johnson, J. Changes in student teacher dogmatism. Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 62, 224-226.

Jones, D. R., & Harty, H. Secondary school student teachers' classroom control ideologies and amount of engaged instructional activities. High School Journal, 1980, 64, 13-15.

Kleine, P. F., & Pereira, P. Limits of perception: What teacher trainees see and don't see in classrooms. School Review, 1970, 78, 483-497.

Knoll, G. C. Do pre-student teaching experiences change attitudes toward teaching? Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 087 775)

Kulm, G. The effects of practicum experience on the opinions of secondary mathematics teachers. Washington, D.C.: N.P. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 111 691)

Lortie, D. School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Lux, J. E. The impact of field experiences on the competencies and attitudes of prospective social studies teachers. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 088 894)

Mahan, J. M., & Lacefield, W. Educational attitude changes during year-long student teaching. Journal of Experimental Education, 1978, 46(3), 4-14.

Martin, D. W. The educational psychology field experience. The Teacher Educator, 1980, 15(3), 10-15.

Marso, R. M. Project Interaction: A pilot study in a phase of teacher preparation. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 194-198.

Marso, R. M., & Reed, R. L. Observable changes in student teacher behaviors following field oriented elementary education programs. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 085 395)

Melograno, V. J. Changes in selected characteristics of preservice teachers following variable, semi-variable, and non-variable field experiences. Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland State University, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126 010)

Newlove, B. W., & Fuller, F. F. The 15-minute hour: A brief teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 345-350.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Price, R. D. The influence of supervising teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1961, 12, 471-475.

Ross, R. W. The effects of an early field experience program on the Pupil Control Ideology of teacher trainees (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 41, 1029A. (University Microfilms No. 80-18,916)

Ross, S. M., Raines, F. B., Cervetti, M. J., & Dellow, D. A. Field experiences for teacher candidates: A comparison between tutorial and apprenticeship programs on student activities and attitudes. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31(6), 57-61.

Sandefur, J. T. Kansas State Teachers College experimental study of professional education for secondary teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1970, 21, 386-395.

Scherer, C. Effects of early field experience on student teachers' self concepts and performance. Journal of Experimental Education, 1978, 47, 208-214.

Seperson, M., & Joyce, B. Teaching styles of student teachers as related to those of their cooperating teachers. Educational Leadership, 1973, 31, 146-151.

Seiforth, B., & Samuel, M. The emergence of Early Field Experiences. Peabody Journal of Education, 1979, 57, 10-16.

Sorenson, G., & Halpert, R. Stress in student teaching. California Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 19, 28-33.

Sunal, D. W. Effect of field experience during elementary methods courses on preservice teacher behavior. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1980, 17(1), 17-23.

Swann, M. An experiment in field-based elementary teacher education. Shepherdstown, West Virginia: Shepherd College, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 084 241)

Thompson, M. L. Identifying anxieties experienced by student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1963, 14, 435-439.

Travers, R. M., Rabinowitz, W., & Nemovichore, E. The anxieties of a group of student teachers. Educational Administration and Supervision, 1952, 38, 368-375.

Van Patton, O. J. The role of the first education course. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28(1), 9-14.

Walberg, H. J. Changes in the self concept during teacher training. Psychology in the Schools, 1967, 4, 14-21.

Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. The school and Pupil Control Ideology. University Park, Pennsylvania: Penn State Studies, 1967.

Wright, B. D., & Tuska, S. A. From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 253-293.

Yee, Z. Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 327-332.

Zeichner, K. M. Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31(6), 45-55.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Lila L. Buchanan was born on February 12, 1938, in Batesville, Indiana, the daughter of schoolteachers Fannie and Jacob Whalbring. After graduating from Osgood High School, Osgood, Indiana, she entered Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana. Marriage and the birth of her first child temporarily delayed her education, and in 1960, she entered Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana. In 1962, she received a Bachelor of Arts degree in language arts in education. From 1962 to 1964, she taught English and history in grades 7 through 12 in Daleville Public Schools, Daleville, Indiana.

During the next 12 years, she assumed numerous roles. In addition to being a wife, mother, church and civic leader, she served as part-time teacher, school parent volunteer, and worked as a decorator in the private sector.

Armed with a need to return to being a professional educator, she entered the University of Central Florida in 1976, seeking a Master of Education in guidance and counseling which was awarded in 1978. She began her work toward the degree of Doctor of Education in 1979 in the University of Florida/University of Central Florida cooperative doctoral program in instructional leadership. During her doctoral work, she served the University of Central Florida as adjunct instructor, graduate assistant, and graduate teaching associate.

Currently, Ms. Buchanan is serving as a consultant to the University of Central Florida Teacher Center. She is married to William R. Buchanan and has two sons, Gregory and Kevin.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Wm D. Hedges

William D. Hedges, Chairman
Professor of Instructional
Leadership and Support

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Paul S. George

Paul S. George
Professor of General Teacher
Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Charles A. Henderson

Charles A. Henderson
Associate Professor of Subject
Specialization Teacher Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Marcella L. Kysilka

Marcella L. Kysilka
Professor of Instructional
Leadership and Support

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Robert R. Lange
Professor of Instructional
Leadership and Support

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December, 1981

Dean for Graduate Studies and
Research